

Rtl for Literacy: Tier 3 Checklist

SAU - School _____

Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: The Tier 3 Team should collaboratively complete this checklist at two checkpoints during the first (development) school year and annually thereafter to monitor activities for implementation of Rtl for Literacy: Tier 3.

Tier 3 Team Members (and Roles):

| TASKS | STATUS: I, P, N |
|--|--------------------|
| I - In place P - Partially in place N - Not in place | |
| MONITOR TIER 1, 2, & INFRASTRUCTURE There is a school leadership team or literacy team who agree that Tiers 1 & 2 are in place and are implemented consistently by teachers and staff. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of items on the Literacy Universal Team Checklist (LUnTCh) (including administrator involvement, staff vote, universal screening, protected instruction time, and fidelity measures) and on the Tier 2 checklist are in place • 75% on PET-R | |
| An action plan for continuous improvement of Tiers 1 & 2 (based on student outcome and fidelity of implementation data) is in place. | |
| 80% of the student population is meeting or exceeding literacy expectations (standards) in response to Tier 1. (If not, continue to focus resources on improving Tier 1.) | |
| Students receiving a Tier 2 & 3 strategies and supports do so in addition to Tier 1 instruction and DI. | |
| A knowledgeable and skilled coach with expertise in literacy content is identified to provide coaching to teachers and staff, and has time identified in his/her schedule to do so. | |
| The function of a knowledgeable and skilled facilitator, with expertise in Rtl, managing change/changing systems, and team collaboration (including facilitating meetings, as well as training in content, evaluation, and data-based decision making) has been identified to facilitate the team process, facilitate effective and efficient meetings, and provide support for continuous improvement of Rtl, and has time in his/her schedule to do so. | |



| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| COMMUNICATION, CONSENSUS, and COMMITMENT | |
| There is a school/district shared vision statement for Tier 3 including the desired outcomes for a Tier 3 system of intensive intervention and supports that aims to close the achievement gap for struggling readers. | |
| A knowledgeable and skilled Tier 3 Team (or comparable structure) exists which assumes ownership and oversight for design, implementation (including consensus, infrastructure, and stages of implementation) and sustainability of Tier 3. | |
| Tier 3 Team(s) is representative of key stakeholders (general ed, special ed, title 1, etc.) and coaches (RTI, Behavior, Literacy, etc). | |
| There is crossover membership and/or communication to integrate the status of Tier 3 (design features, students enrolled, efficacy, etc.) with other literacy initiatives, the Tier 1 & 2 teams, and the school-wide RtI system. | |
| The Tier 3 team has an explicit communication strategy in place to coordinate with district/SAU Tier 3 efforts and works toward consensus with a consistent district-wide approach. | |
| Team members create a mission statement and can articulate the mission to others. | |
| A Tier 3 Team (or comparable structure) uses effective group process and monitors that process by completing the Collaborative Team Checklist. | |
| A Tier 3 Team (or comparable structure) understands the process and importance of building consensus and uses consensus building strategies to gain commitment of stakeholders to the Tier 3 system. | |
| Criteria for differentially determining which students might benefit from Tier 3 supports (using multiple data sources) have been made with staff input, staff commitment, and administrative approval. | |
| All school staff have been trained in and know the process for requesting Tier 3 support for students. | |
| | |



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>IDENTIFY and ADOPT a FULL COMPLEMENT of INTENSIVE INTERVENTIONS</p> <p>Complete an audit of currently available interventions. Review the relevant evidence-base, efficacy, and local fit for each and decide to keep or replace each.</p> | |
| <p>Conduct a discrepancy analysis of currently available Intensive Interventions relative to the components of evidence-based practices (phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency; Whole-to-Part Model including word identification, language comprehension, and print processing)</p> | |
| <p>School identifies Tier 3 strategies that are consistent with Tier 1 curriculum philosophy and adopts a full complement of evidence-based literacy interventions. This is reviewed and updated annually.</p> | |
| <p>Each Tier 3 strategy includes orientation material and procedures for the staff and families.</p> | |
| | |
| <p>IDENTIFY and ADOPT a FULL COMPLEMENT of DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENTS</p> <p>Diagnostic assessment tools have been selected that allow decisions to be made to pinpoint interventions.</p> | |
| <p>Team is clear on purposes for assessment at various points in the assessment process: screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic.</p> | |
| <p>Diagnostic assessment tools allow a complete instructional profile to be created: word identification (automaticity, phonics and phonemic awareness), language comprehension (vocabulary and genre knowledge), print processing & fluency.</p> | |
| <p>Members of the team are clear on when to use diagnostic assessment tools within the decision making process.</p> | |
| | |
| <p>IDENTIFY and MATCH STUDENTS WITH INSTRUCTION, INTERVENTIONS, SUPPORTS, AND TEXT</p> <p>There are documented decision-rules for which students access Tier 3 strategies and the process is implemented consistently. (This includes the identified criteria from the screening results e.g., what scores and/or other data will trigger teacher to consider student for Tier 3; what scores or other data suggest student continues at Tier 2 or 1 with differentiation).</p> | |
| | |



| | |
|---|--|
| Students are matched with interventions, supports, and texts within the first 4-6weeks of school. | |
| Multiple sources of data (diagnostics + screening + historical assessments + teacher observation and conferencing notes, etc.) are used to identify specific areas of need and determine plan for the student’s entire day. | |
| The plan for the student’s entire day addresses: general accommodations and supports for participating in the social and academic aspects of the general education classroom, specific supports for participating in literacy Tier 1 and 2 , reader/text matching, as well as participation in the intensive interventions. | |
| As students are matched to intensive interventions, the plans include the time (minutes per day, per week), place, and teacher as well as a process for monitoring fidelity of implementation. | |
| Intensive interventions are delivered in groups with no more than 3 students assigned to any one group. | |
| | |
| IDENTIFY, MATCH, TRAIN, and COACH EXPERT SI & TI PROVIDERS | |
| Identify and match a sufficient amount of providers to intensive interventions based on expertise. | |
| Train intensive intervention providers to fidelity and provide them with ongoing coaching to ensure competency. | |
| Fidelity of implementation in intensive interventions is monitored (via self-assessment and coaching). | |
| Intensive intervention providers not implementing to an agreed upon level of fidelity are given targeted and individualized professional development – including coaching. | |
| | |
| PROGRESS MONITOR TIER 3 FOR LITERACY | |
| Documented decision rules are used for determining to continue, switch, or discontinue Tier 3 strategies. | |
| Progress monitoring tools are matched to intervention provided, for example progress in a comprehension intervention is monitored with a comprehension assessment tool. | |



| | |
|---|--|
| Intensive interventions providers are trained to fidelity to use progress monitoring tools and strategies. | |
| Progress monitoring is scheduled and conducted (4x/month). | |
| Progress monitoring data are plotted against an aim line and results are shared with student (as appropriate) at each assessment. | |
| Progress monitoring data are entered into the appropriate data-management system. | |
| Regular (weekly or biweekly) meetings are scheduled and held to review progress monitoring data at each grade level. Data are examined according to established processes to determine individual student progress. | |
| Findings are communicated between classroom teachers and intensive intervention providers to compare student performance results (in class vs. with provider). | |
| | |
| EFFICACY | |
| Fidelity of Tier 3 strategies is assessed (at least annually) to ensure they are implemented as designed. | |
| A logging system for collecting data on the effectiveness of Targeted, Tier 3 supports is developed. | |
| Progress monitoring and outcome data are examined (at least annually) to determine overall response to intensive interventions. (Summarize % of students receiving Tier 3 who returned to Tier 2 or 1, met growth targets, continued in Tier 3; Summarize % of students scoring proficient based on Tier 3 supports.) | |
| Tier 3 strategies are updated regularly (at least annually) in response to fidelity and efficacy findings. | |
| | |
| STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATION: | |
| The number of students, program fidelity, progress of students receiving Tier 3 supports, and efficacy results are regularly reported to stakeholders. | |
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| A plan for communicating with families on the process to initiate Tier 3 interventions, and on how to monitor progress and make determinations to continue/discontinue have been developed and implemented. | |
| The use of Tier 3 strategies includes frequent communication with the family. | |
| Team has ongoing school staff checks for consensus with the proposed infrastructure and implementation of the Tier 3 program of Rtl for Literacy. | |
| Team has developed goals and indicators of success for the year as part of a strategic planning process. | |
| This plan is monitored and reviewed regularly (2 or more times per year) in the first 2 years of implementation and annually thereafter. | |
| Using various data sources (e.g., fidelity, efficacy, outcome), team members have developed and regularly update a professional development plan (for themselves and the school) that aligns with the work of the team. | |

Adapted from:

Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (Anderson, Childs, Kincaid, Horner, George, Todd, Sampson, & Spaulding, 2010)

Effective Reading Support Team Implementation Checklist (Michigan Behavior & Learning Support Initiative, 2005)

Jorgensen, McSheehan, & Sonnenmeier (2009) Beyond Access Model: Promoting Membership, Participation, and Learning of Students with Disabilities in General Education Classrooms. Brookes Publishing, Inc. Baltimore, MD.

Rtl Tier 2 Secondary Systems Team Self-Assessment and Action Planning Tool (Muscott & Mann, 2009)