



Rapid Response—Response to Intervention (RtI) Implementation and Monitoring

Date	November 16, 2009
Number	000101
Request	In 2007, two state departments of education (SDEs) served by the Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC) requested information on monitoring tools or instruments to assess the quality of district/school implementation of response to intervention. This rapid response offers an update to the information previously provided.
Summary	In updating this response, SECC staff consulted the research base on implementation, including the work of Dean Fixsen of the National Implementation Research Network and the State Implementation of Scaling-Up Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center funded by the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs. Staff also reviewed the monitoring, self-assessment, and planning tools identified in the previous rapid response on this issue and conducted searches of SDE Web sites for revised or additional information regarding RtI implementation and monitoring processes.

INTRODUCTION

Response to intervention has materialized as a potentially valuable component for effecting school improvement (Shores & Chester, 2009). Heralded as a vehicle to improve the academic achievement of all students through the efficient allocation of school resources and evidence-based interventions grounded in student assessment data (Burns & VanDerHeyden, 2006), RtI offers a framework for the use of data-driven, decision-making models in improving student learning outcomes (Burns & Gibbons, 2008). Research on RtI suggests that it can result in improved student academic achievement, reductions in the frequency of negative student behaviors, and an

increase in positive academic behaviors such as task completion and comprehension during classroom instruction (Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005; Kovalski, Gickling, Morrow, & Swank, 1999; Lau et al., 2006). Schools and districts employing an RtI framework may also realize systemwide benefits such as a reduction in the number of students referred for special education disability determination or a decrease in their percentage of students found eligible for special education services (Burns & Gibbons). Missing from this brief summary of positive student and institutional outcomes related to RtI, however, is a discussion of how an RtI framework and its component parts are *implemented* in order to produce these desired results.

Research on Implementation

According to Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, and Wallace (2005), attention to implementation is paramount in moving evidence-based programs into natural settings with fidelity and improved outcomes for clients. The implementation of reform initiatives in educational contexts first received significant attention with the Great Society programs of the Johnson administration in the 1960s. Studies of outcomes for children, families, and communities targeted in a variety of programs funded under this legislation revealed generally weak or limited effects (Fixsen et al., 2005; Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, & Wallace, 2007). Fixsen et al. (2007) and others (Elliott & Mihalic, 2004) have, in part, attributed such failures in bridging the research-to-practice gap to a lack of sufficient attention to implementation activities.

Implementation, in the context of public education, may be defined as the “art and science” of bringing evidence-based practices to school and classroom settings in order to benefit children, teachers, and society (Fixsen et al., 2007, p. 4). In an extensive synthesis of the literature concerning the evaluation of implementation efforts, Fixsen and his colleagues (2005) have identified six stages of implementation (1) exploration, (2) installation, (3) initial implementation, (4) full implementation, (5) innovation, and (6) sustainability which generally takes at least 2 to 4 years to complete. The process may be marked by both advancement and regression between stages. For example, a school at the innovation stage may be working on how to extend RtI to foreign language instruction one year; while high staff turnover and budget cuts the following year yields a return to the installation stage because fewer than 50 percent of their staff are demonstrating acceptable performance within their RtI roles. The initial and full implementation stages are composed of several core, integrated components that serve to shape practitioner behavior and build organizational culture to support the successful use of new practice. The components Fixsen et al. (2005) identified include (1) staff recruitment and selection, (2) ongoing training, (3) coaching and consultation, (4) staff performance evaluation, (5) data systems to support decision making, (6) administration that supports the needs of practitioners to achieve the desired outcomes, and (7) strategies that engender external systems to assist in supporting the innovation. These components are not only integrated but are also mutually supportive, compensating for a component that may be functioning at a less than desirable level. For example, strong coaching and consultation may serve to accommodate for a training program that is in the process of being rewritten.

The importance of coaching to implementation evokes the work of Joyce and Showers (1982), their contemporaries (Baker, 1983; Bush, 1984), and, more recently, Truesdale (2003), who all found that the addition of coaching to traditional models of staff development greatly facilitated transfer of this training to actual practice. As states look to advance implementation of RtI from isolated exemplars to typical application (i.e., scaling up), the need for individuals with sound knowledge of RtI and the implementation process to support practitioners through training and coaching becomes apparent. Fixsen, Blasé, Horner, and Sugai (2009) have gone as far to suggest that the effective movement to scale of evidence-based programs is contingent on external supports such as trainers and coaches.

In their work with the center on State Implementation of Scaling-Up Evidence-based Practices (SISEP), Fixsen and his colleagues have embarked on a 4-year project to develop the capacity of six states to support the scaling up of selected evidence-based practices, including RtI, in selected local educational agencies (LEAs). Beginning in late 2008, SISEP began meeting on a monthly basis with state management teams (SMTs) to deepen the state department’s understanding of scaling up and to build an infrastructure of support. This support structure included

the creation of implementation teams comprised of individuals with formal and practical knowledge of both the innovative practice and the stages and components of implementation. These teams have begun working with identified LEAs in the six states and, although in its early stages, the project is progressing according to its design. More information on SISEP and the projects can be found at www.scalingup.org

A vigorous focus on implementation activities can serve to bridge the gap between science and practice (Fixsen et al., 2005, 2007). An understanding of the stages and the time required to achieve full implementation of evidence-based practices, coupled with attention to the core components that support implementation, can help a school or district increase the probability of its success in improving learner outcomes as it moves evidence-based research from the hands of the researcher to the teacher's classroom and his or her students.

Rtl Implementation

In a recent interview with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (Fall, 2008), Dean Fixsen specifically addressed the implementation of Rtl within the context of his work on the implementation gap. Responding to a question concerning the most important consideration for a school or district beginning to implement Rtl, he spoke of the vital importance of clarity in describing an intervention. In clearly describing the critical features of an intervention or practice, one can teach the components to others, support them in applying these in their work through coaching and consultation, and monitor the fidelity of this application. The process and outcome data generated within this system can serve to inform leadership of needed external systems of support.

This rapid response sought not only to identify states that provided a general framework for Rtl but also to locate those that offered specific resources related to implementation that might aid districts in delineating essential features with the clarity that, according to Fixsen et al., is necessary in moving evidenced-based practice to scale.

Limitations of Rapid Response Report

The goal of this report is to provide decision makers and other stakeholders with information on Rtl implementation and monitoring that would enable them to compare their own guidance and supports for LEAs implementing Rtl while also considering various means of assessing the quality and fidelity of this implementation.

In researching the request, SECC staff reviewed resources contained within the previous rapid response on this issue, searched all state department Web sites for Rtl frameworks and implementation guidance, conducted additional Web searches for more current resources, and reviewed recent research publications. No evidence-based studies were identified that provided information specific to the actual implementation of Rtl practices.

Decision makers should recognize that the selected information featured in this report is not inclusive of all available resources on the topic of Rtl implementation and monitoring. Another limitation, albeit less so than 2 years ago, is that a small number of states have yet to offer formal guidance to LEAs on Rtl.

Information Gathering Process

To promote the utility of findings, SECC researched Rtl frameworks and guidance for all 50 states. In addition to state department Web sites, SECC staff reviewed information from the National Center on Response to Intervention, the National Implementation Research Network, and SISEP.

Of the 50 states that SECC researched, state RtI guideline or framework information was obtained for 41 states (82 percent), and 31 of 50 (62 percent) states provided specific information for schools and districts related to RtI implementation/monitoring.

In the appendices, Table 1 provides information on those states that have RtI framework or guidance documents posted on their Web sites and any specific state department information related to the implementation and monitoring of RtI. Table 2 offers information related to implementation from sources other than SDEs.

REFERENCES

- Baker, R. G. (1983). The contribution of coaching to transfer of training: An extension study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44(11), 3260. (UMI No. 8403713).
- Burns, M. K., Appleton, J. J., & Stehouwer, J. D. (2005). Meta-analytic review of response-to-intervention research: Examining field-based and research-implemented models. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 23, 381–394.
- Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. A. (2008). *Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools: Procedures to assure scientific-based practices*. New York: Routledge.
- Burns, M. K., & VanDerHeyden, A. M. (2006). Using response to intervention to assess learning disabilities: Introduction to the special series. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 32, 3–5.
- Bush, R. N. (1984). Effective staff development [Electronic version]. In *Making our schools more effective: Proceedings of three state conferences* (pp. 223–239). San Francisco: Far West Laboratories. Retrieved September 22, 2009, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED249576>
- Elliott, D. S., & Mihalic, S. (2004). Issues in disseminating and replicating effective prevention programs. *Prevention Science*, 5(1), 47–52.
- Fixsen, D., Blase, K., Horner, R., and Sugai, G. (2009). *Developing the capacity for scaling up the effective use of evidence-based programs in state departments of education*. Retrieved September 11, 2009, from http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~sisep/docs/Concept_Paper_SISEP_0409_WEB.pdf
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network. Retrieved September 11, 2009, from http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/pdf/Monograph_full.pdf
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., & Wallace, F. (2007). Implementation: The missing link between research and practice. *The APSAC Advisor*, 19(1–2), 4–11.
- Knight, J. (Ed). (2009). *Coaching: approaches and perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kovaleski, J. F., Gickling, E. E., & Morrow, H. (1999). High versus low implementation of instructional support teams: A case for maintaining program fidelity. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20, 170–183.

Lau, M. Y., Sieler, J. D., Muyskens, P., Canter, A., Vankeuren, B., & Marston, D. (2006). Perspectives on the use of the problem-solving model from the viewpoint of a school psychologist, administrator, and teacher from a large Midwest urban school district. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43, 117–127.

Shores, C., & Chester, K. (2009). *Using RtI for school improvement: Raising every student's achievement scores*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Truesdale, W. T. (2003). The implementation of peer coaching on the transferability of staff development to classroom practice in two selected Chicago public elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(11), 3923. (UMI No. 3112485).

Rapid Responses are customized reports that are prepared to fulfill requests for information by the departments of education of the states served by the Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL. The responses address topics on current education issues related to the requirements and implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. For additional information, visit the SECC Web site at secc.sedl.org.

Wesley A. Hoover, PhD, SEDL President and CEO
Robin Jarvis, PhD, SECC Program Manager
Chris Times, MBA, SECC Communications Associate and Publication Editor

Rapid Response Team: Dale Lewis, Program Associate; and Erin McCann, Program Associate

Alabama State Liaison: Lou Meadows, EdD (lmeadows@sedl.org)
Georgia State Liaison: Glenda Copeland, MA (gcopeland@sedl.org)
Louisiana State Liaison: Darlene Morgan Brown, PhD (dbrown@sedl.org)
Mississippi State Liaison: Debra Meibaum, MAT (dmeibaum@sedl.org)
South Carolina State Liaison: Sandra Lindsay, EdD (slindsay@mailbox.sc.edu)

The Southeast Comprehensive Center is a project of SEDL
SEDL Headquarters
4700 Mueller Blvd.
Austin, TX 78723
800-476-6861
www.sedl.org

Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL
3501 N. Causeway Blvd, Suite 700
Metairie, LA 70002
800-644-8671
secc.sedl.org

Copyright © 2009 by SEDL. SECC is one of 16 regional centers established by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The primary goal of the regional centers is to build the capacity of the state education agencies and statewide systems of support to implement NCLB. Links to the other regional centers, the content centers, and ED may be found on the SECC Web site (secc.sedl.org). The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from ED. The contents do not, however, necessarily represent the policy of ED, and one should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendices

Table 1

Rtl Framework Documents and Implementation
Resources from State Departments of Education

Table 2

Additional Resources Regarding
Rtl Implementation/Monitoring

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Alabama	Alabama's Response to Instruction: Core Support for All Students: http://www.alsde.edu/general/RESPONSE_TO_INSTRUCTION.pdf	***
Alaska	Alaska's Response to Intervention http://www.eed.state.ak.us/nclb/pdf/RTI_Definitions.pdf	Results of implementation survey administered during Fall 2008: http://www.eed.state.ak.us/nclb/pdf/RTI_SurveySummary_Sept2008.pdf
Arkansas	The Arkansas Literacy Intervention Matrix includes lessons incorporating tiered interventions for struggling students. http://literacymatrix.com	***
Arizona	Arizona's RtI Web page: http://www.azed.gov/azrti	Response to intervention district/school self-assessment: http://www.azed.gov/azrti/RTIselfassessment.pdf Descriptions of essential elements by RtI tier: http://www.azed.gov/azrti/AZ3Tiered-levelsStudentSupport.pdf#tier1
California	California's Department of Education Web site for response to instruction and intervention provides general information and guidance related to the use of RtI in special education eligibility determination for specific learning disability. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/	In its guide, Determining Specific Learning Disability Eligibility Using Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI ²), California offers the tool, Components to Ensure Success in RtI: A Self-Assessment, in Appendix A. Districts and schools may use this tool to determine their current RtI implementation status. http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/sr/documents/sldeligibiltyrti2.pdf

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Colorado	<p>Colorado's framework is described in, Response to Intervention (RtI): A Practitioner's Guide to Implementation.</p> <p>http://www.cde.state.co.us/RtI/downloads/PDF/RtIGuide.pdf</p>	<p>Self-Assessment Document: http://www.cde.state.co.us/RtI/downloads/Word/RTI_SelfAssessment.doc</p> <p>Evaluation Rubric: http://www.cde.state.co.us/RtI/downloads/PDF/EvaluationRubric.pdf</p> <p>Comprehensive Evaluation Tool: http://www.cde.state.co.us/RtI/downloads/PDF/RTI-CET.pdf</p> <p>Professional development continuum for six core areas of RtI, across three levels of proficiency: beginning, intermediate, and advanced: http://www.cde.state.co.us/RtI/downloads/PDF/RtI_ContinuumofTraining.pdf</p>
Connecticut	<p>Connecticut's RtI framework document, Using Scientific Research-Based Interventions: Improving Education for All Students:</p> <p>http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/Pressroom/SRBI_full.pdf</p>	<p>Scientific, research-based instruction Self-Assessment Tool to provide schools information they need to implement RtI with fidelity: http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/word_docs/cali/srbi_self_assessment_csde_october_2008.doc</p> <p>Classroom walk-through tool: http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/word_docs/curriculum/cali/srbi_walkthrough_selfassessment.doc</p>
Delaware	<p>Delaware's Response to Intervention Web page:</p> <p>http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/staff/profdev/rti_docs.shtml</p>	<p>RtI teacher implementation guide describes activities by tier: http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/staff/profdev/rti_files/ImplementationGuideRBmerged2.doc</p> <p>RtI tools including school leadership and teacher planning guides assessing component and Microsoft Excel spreadsheets for compiling data on implementation at teacher, grade level, and building level: http://www.doe.k12.de.us/infosuites/staff/profdev/rti_new.shtml</p>
Florida	<p>Florida's model for RtI:</p> <p>http://www.florida-rti.org/flMod/definition.htm</p>	<p>Statewide response to instruction/intervention implementation plan: http://www.florida-rti.org/RtI.pdf</p> <p>Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI): http://floridarti.usf.edu/resources/presentations/2008/CurtisNASP2008/SystemsChange/SAPSI.pdf</p>

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Georgia	RtI Web page contains a significant number of resources, including Georgia's RtI guidance document: http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ci_services.aspx?PageReq=CIServRTI	Chapter 9 of the RtI guidance document provides information regarding implementation fidelity: http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/DMGetDocument.aspx/Chapter%209%20Fidelity%20of%20Implementation.pdf?p=6CC6799F8C1371F629C13CBF50C40F3C933BFD2C32CE92F150B5DDF13E2D2061&Type=D
Hawaii	***	***
Idaho	Guidance manual: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/RTI/docs/RTI%20Guidance%20Final.pdf	Section III of the guidance manual discusses implementation, from readiness to assessing fidelity. A Microsoft Excel tool for evaluating the level of successful implementation and setting priorities around five key areas (discussed in Section II of the guidance document), leadership, teams and processes, assessment, curriculum and assessment, parent and community engagement: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/RTI/docs/RTI%20Indicators%20IDAHO%2003-2009.xls
Illinois	Illinois State Response to Intervention (RtI) Plan: http://www.isbe.net/pdf/rti_state_plan.pdf	District Self-Assessment for Implementation readiness: http://www.isbe.net/RtI_plan/rti_template.doc Webcast training video regarding state and district plan: http://www.state.il.us/video/streaming/isbe/response-to-intervention-041108.asx
Indiana	Guidance Document: http://www.doe.in.gov/indiana-rti/docs/2009-11-14-RTIGuidanceDocument.pdf	Chapter 3 of the guidance document addresses stages of implementation for an RtI framework beginning with consensus building and including a discussion of fidelity. District, school, and classroom fidelity self-assessments are provided in the appendices of the manual (pp. 81–85). A Tiered System for Academics Flow Chart on page 114 offers a visual depiction of the RtI framework.

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Iowa	***	***
Kansas	Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS): http://www.kansasmtss.org/index.htm	The MTSS Innovation Configuration Matrix describes ideal characteristics of implementation, applicable across all grade levels and all content areas. http://www.kansasmtss.org/all/Kansas MTSS Innovation Configuration Matrix.pdf
Kentucky	Kentucky System of Interventions: http://www.education.ky.gov/users/otl/RTI/KSI%2010_30.pdf	***
Louisiana	***	***
Maine	RtI/Pre-Referral Guide: http://www.maine.gov/education/rti/referral_guide.rtf	Tool for assessing implementation: www.maine.gov/education/rti/readiness_implementation_tool.pdf The Configuration Map and Planning Rubric describes characteristics aligned with awareness, exploration, and implementation stages across six areas: data-driven decision making, collaborations, parent partnerships, teams, three-tiered interventions, and research-based best practice: http://www.maine.gov/education/rti/rubric.rtf
Maryland	A Tiered Instructional Approach to Support Achievement for All Students: http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/0E934240-08D1-4906-A767-DF18EC7D2745/17125/Tiered_Instructional_ApproachRtI_June2009.pdf	The framework document describes components to include that facilitate effective implementation of Tier I (p. 14), Tier II (p. 15), and Tier III (p. 18). Fidelity of implementation at both the district and school levels and ways in which teachers, coaches, administrators, and central office personnel can contribute to the fidelity of implementation are also addressed (pp. 21–24).
Massachusetts	***	***
Michigan	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi): http://www.cenmi.org/miblsi/Home.aspx	Michigan has been participating with SISEP to develop the Michigan Implementation Network (MIN) to support the scaling up of evidenced-based practices in the areas of behavior and reading. Information about this collaboration can be found at http://www.cenmi.org/miblsi/MiBLSiModel/Support.aspx

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Minnesota	***	***
Mississippi	RtI Manual: http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/IPS/rti/MDE_RtI_T1%20Manual_Draft%207-08.pdf	Essential elements matrices for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III provide qualitative descriptions of activities for evaluation/monitoring purposes: http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/IPS/rti/Essential_Elements_Matrices_Draft_2008.html
Missouri	Web site for Missouri's Three-Tiered Model: http://www.dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/	***
Montana	Framework: http://www.opi.mt.gov/RegForms/RTI/Index.html	Self-assessment document for determining level of implementation and establishing priorities for future steps: http://www.opi.mt.gov/pub/rti/GS/RTITools/MTRTISelf_Assess.doc
Nebraska	RtI Technical Assistance Guidelines: http://rtinebraska.unl.edu/documents/pdf/tadocprintable.pdf	Guidelines include a discussion of moving to scale including a developmental progression of practices and potential pitfalls in attempting to move to full-scale implementation (pp. 15–19). http://rtinebraska.unl.edu/tech_assistance3.html
New Hampshire	An Interactive Guide to RtI in New Hampshire: http://www.ed.state.nh.us/education/programs/documents/INTERACTIVEGUIDETORTI-NH.pdf	***
New Jersey	***	***
New Mexico	New Mexico's guidance document, Response to Intervention: A Systematic Process to Increase Learning Outcomes for All Students: http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/acc.assess/assess/dl/misc/RtIManualFinalCombo2006%2012-06.pdf	New Mexico's brief guide to understanding and implementing RtI describes features and implementation considerations for each tier within the framework. http://www.ped.state.nm.us/RtI/dl09/Understanding%20Response%20to%20Inter.pdf
New York	New York State's Response to Intervention Technical Assistance Center: http://www.nysrti.org/	***

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Nevada	***	***
North Carolina	<p>Training materials related to the states' responsiveness to instruction model include sample forms, case study examples, and information specific to reading, math, and positive behavior supports:</p> <p>http://www.ncpublicschools.org/ec/development/learning/responsiveness/rtimaterials</p>	***
North Dakota	<p>Guidance document, Response to Intervention in a Unified North Dakota Educational System:</p> <p>http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/speced/personnel/RTI.pdf</p> <p>Web page:</p> <p>http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/title1/response.shtml</p>	<p>North Dakota Department of Public Instruction RtI Implementation Plan describes how the state will support full scale implementation:</p> <p>http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/speced/personnel/plan.pdf</p>
Ohio	<p>This presentation handout from a September 2008 Ohio Department of Education special education conference describes the RtI framework in Ohio:</p> <p>http://education.ohio.gov/GD/DocumentManagement/DocumentDownload.aspx?DocumentID=56407</p>	<p>Analysis guides for elementary and secondary literacy, mathematics, and positive behavior supports:</p> <p>http://www.hcesc.org/resources/Pages/ResponsetoIntervention.aspx</p>
Oklahoma	***	***
Oregon	<p>Oregon's Response to Intervention Initiative (Or-RtI) Web page:</p> <p>http://www.ode.state.or.us/initiatives/idea/rti.aspx</p>	<p>District/school readiness checklist: http://www.ode.state.or.us/initiatives/idea/rti_readiness_checklist.doc</p>
Pennsylvania	<p>Pennsylvania's Training and Technical Assistance Network Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI) Web page:</p> <p>http://www.pattan.net/teachlead/ResponsetoIntervention.aspx</p>	<p>Implementation Guide:</p> <p>http://www.pattan.net/files/rti/rti-implguide1108.pdf</p>

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Rhode Island	<p>Rhode Island's Technical Assistance Project in Collaboration with the state department of education, Office of Special Population and Rhode Island College offer guidance on RtI:</p> <p>http://www.ritap.org/rti/about/overview.php</p>	***
South Carolina	<p>South Carolina's RtI documents are available on its RtI Web site:</p> <p>http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Standards-and-Learning/Academic-Standards/old/Instructional-PromisingPractices/documents/ResponsetoIntervention.html</p>	***
South Dakota	<p>South Dakota's RtI Web page:</p> <p>http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/forms/RtI/index.asp</p> <p>Draft guidance document:</p> <p>http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/forms/RtI/docs/RTI.Draft.8.16.07.pdf</p>	<p>Implementation fidelity checklist recommended to be completed on a quarterly basis to help guide districts toward full implementation of essential RtI components:</p> <p>http://doe.sd.gov/oess/specialed/forms/RtI/docs/FIDELITYCHECKLIST.pdf</p>
Tennessee	<p>The Tennessee Department of Education offers a link to a document developed by Hardeman County School District for school districts and schools interested in getting started with RtI:</p> <p>http://state.tn.us/education/speced/doc/101008seconf07.pdf</p>	<p>Indicators of school readiness for RtI implementation: http://state.tn.us/education/speced/doc/101008seconf07.pdf</p>
Texas	<p>RtI in Texas: 2008–2009 Response to Intervention Guidance:</p> <p>http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/curriculum/RtI/RtIGuidanceDocument.pdf</p>	***
Utah	<p>Utah's Three-Tier Model of Reading Instruction:</p> <p>http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/Documents/TADorevised5-23-07_000.pdf</p>	<p>The guidance document provides elementary (pp. 25–30) and secondary (pp. 31–36) administrator implementation checklists addressing preliminary strategies and components by tier.</p>

Table 1. RtI Framework Documents and Implementation Resources from State Departments of Education

State	RtI Framework/Guidance Documents	RtI Implementation/Monitoring Resources
Vermont	***	<p>This resource, A Student Support Method to Attain School Quality Standards Using RtI as a Decision-Making Tool, aligns critical features of RtI with Vermont's school quality standards and provides space for district and school leadership teams to delineate a work plan to guide implementation.</p> <p>http://education.vermont.gov/new/pdfdoc/pgm_sped/forms/rti/rti_sqs.pdf</p>
Virginia	<p>Virginia's guidance document, Responsive Instruction: Refining Our Work of Teaching All Children:</p> <p>http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/studentsrvcs/RTI/guidance_document.pdf</p>	<p>Chapter 5 (pp. 37–47) of the guidance document discusses implementation of RtI including the tasks and needs of teams and individuals involved in implementation.</p>
Washington	<p>Washington's RtI manual, Using Response to Intervention for Washington's Students:</p> <p>http://www.k12.wa.us/RTI/pubdocs/WashingtonRTIManual.pdf</p>	<p>Appendix I of the guidance manual offers districts and schools a readiness checklist organized around five indicators (leadership, teaming, curriculum, screening, and ongoing professional development) viewed as key components in ensuring successful RtI implementation.</p> <p>The implementation Web page offers a variety of resources to guide implementation including step-by-step guidelines and training materials:</p> <p>http://www.k12.wa.us/RTI/Implementation/default.aspx</p>
West Virginia	<p>Implementation and Technical Assistance Guide:</p> <p>http://wvde.state.wv.us/osp/RtIimpGuide91906.DOC</p> <p>Web page:</p> <p>http://wvde.state.wv.us/osp/RtIOSP.html</p>	<p>Several implementation resources are available on West Virginia's RtI implementation Web page (http://wvde.state.wv.us/osp/RtIImplementation.html), including the state's timeline for scaling up RtI, an implementation checklist, and a readiness assessment. In addition, Chapter 5 of the implementation and technical assistance guide is devoted exclusively to implementation and addresses areas such as scheduling, special education service delivery, and the roles of various staff members.</p>
Wisconsin	<p>Wisconsin's Web page on Response to Intervention/ Instruction:</p> <p>http://dpi.wi.gov/rti/index.html</p>	<p>Wisconsin's response to intervention self-assessment tool assesses the alignment of school/district existing structures and processes to Wisconsin's guiding principles of RtI, high-quality instruction, ongoing review of student progress, and collaboration:</p> <p>http://dpi.wi.gov/rti/pdf/rtiassess.pdf</p>
Wyoming	***	***

Notes: *** No information found.

The information in this table does not address all RtI implementation and monitoring processes and resources available but discusses those for which information was obtained by SECC staff. Also, SECC does not endorse any of the processes, policies, or resources discussed in this report.

Table 2. Additional Resources Regarding RtI Implementation/Monitoring

Source	Description and Web Address (URL)
All Kinds of Minds, a nonprofit institute for the understanding of learning differences	RtI configuration map: http://www.allkindsofminds.org/documents/Policy/CO_RTI_Map.pdf
Fixsen, D. L., Blasé, K. A., Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (2009, February). <i>Readiness for change. Scaling up brief #3</i> . Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina.	This State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) brief defines the variables a state or large district leadership team may wish to consider as they determine if they are “ready” to invest in the scaling-up of an evidence-based practice. http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~sisep/docs/SISEP_Brief_3_Readiness_2009.pdf
Johnson, E., Mellard, D. F., Fuchs, D., & McKnight, M. A. (2006). <i>Responsiveness to intervention (RTI): How to do it?</i> Lawrence, KS: National Research Center on Learning Disabilities.	Each section (screening, progress monitoring, tiered service delivery, fidelity of implementation) provides standards for judging high quality implementation of core RtI components. http://www.nrcld.org/rti_manual/index.html
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) school and district level implementation blueprints	School: http://www.nasdse.org/Portals/0/SCHOOL.pdf District: http://www.nasdse.org/Portals/0/DISTRICT.pdf
National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI)	The NCRTI offers a set of resources and examples from states, districts, and schools concerning the planning and implementation of RtI. http://www.rti4success.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=45&Itemid=115
St. Croix River Education District (SCRED), St. Croix, MN	SCRED provides an RtI readiness checklist, a list of evidence-based literacy programs and strategies, and integrity checklists for a collection of reading/language programs. http://www.scred.k12.mn.us/School/Index.cfm/go:site.Page/Page:3/Area:4/index.html
Note: The information in this table does not address all RtI implementation and monitoring resources available but discusses those for which information was obtained by SECC staff. Also, SECC does not endorse any of the processes, policies, or resources discussed in this report.	