


	CENTER FOR RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD
	<p><i>Response to Intervention (RTI) in Early Childhood</i></p> <p>~</p> <p><i>What Does It Mean? What Are States Doing? What Are The Challenges?</i></p>
	OSEP Early Childhood Conference, Crystal City, VA December 7, 2009

	Our Presenters Today
<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ Charles Greenwood, CRTIEC - Co-PI<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ University of Kansas❖ Maura Wechsler Linas, CRTIEC - Center Coordinator<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ University of Kansas ❖ CRTIEC Homepage http://www.crtiec.org	



Today's Presentation

- ❖ CRTIEC: Who we are and What we are Doing
- ❖ “Intro/Info Blast” – Key ideas and issues in EC RTI
- ❖ EC RTI Myths (Table Activity)
- ❖ 2009 (March) RTI Implementation Findings
- ❖ RTI Challenges (Table Activity)
- ❖ Discussion with Q&A



CRTIEC and What We are Doing!

- ❖ Mission: To conduct research and provide resources support the application of RTI in Early Childhood Education
- ❖ Objectives
 - Develop and validate
 - Tier 2 and 3 interventions for preschool language and early literacy skills
 - Progress monitoring measures linked to these interventions
 - Evaluate Efficacy
 - Large scale studies to evaluate the efficacy of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions
 - Supplementary studies of related issues
 - Provide national leadership on development and implementation of RTI for young children
 - Broadly disseminate findings to practitioners, researchers and policymakers




Our Key Partners

- ❖ **Leadership, Design, and Evaluation** - University of Kansas, Juniper Gardens Children's Project
 - Charles Greenwood & Judith Carta
- ❖ **Tier 2 Interventions for early literacy and language** – The Ohio State University
 - ❖ Howard Goldstein
- ❖ **Tier 3 Interventions** - Dynamic Measurement Group; Eugene, OR
 - Ruth Kaminski
- ❖ **Progress Monitoring Measurement** - University of Minnesota
 - Scott McConnell
- ❖ **Annual RTI Summit** – Division for Early Childhood-CEC







Intro/Info Blast

Three minutes each or less!...

- ❖ *The Intent and Design of RTI in Early Childhood*
- ❖ *Tier 2 Interventions for Preschool Children*
- ❖ *Tier 3 Interventions for Preschool Children*
- ❖ *Assessment Activities in EC RTI*
- ❖ *Putting it all together in Real-World Classrooms -*




Intent and Design of Rtl in Early Childhood

The Intent: To improve the learning outcomes of ALL children by making interventions more potent and providing them sooner



The Pyramid of Risk





Intent and Design of Rtl in Early Childhood

The Design:

- ❖ Achieve administrative buy-in
- ❖ Use PD known to lead to implementation
- ❖ Screen all children frequently and increase the strength of treatment (intensity) for those not progressing
- ❖ Use interventions with research supporting their effectiveness
- ❖ Provide multiple levels of intensity (Tier 1, 2, 3)
- ❖ Teach skills known to be precursors of next environment skills
- ❖ Measure progress frequently (e.g., monthly, quarterly)
- ❖ Base intervention decisions on technically sound progress measures
- ❖ Implement with fidelity



Tier 2 Interventions for Preschool Children

- ❖ Who will receive Tier 2 support?
 1. Children who are below benchmark on screening
 2. Children not making adequate progress in Tier 1
- ❖ What do we know about these children?
 1. They may lack earlier language and literacy experiences
 2. They may have difficulties engaging Tier 1 instruction
 3. May include children who are eligible and receiving ECSE




Tier 2 Skill-Focused Listening Center Activities Intervention


- ❖ How?
 - Children use headphones for audio and a book
 - Interactive activities are monitored by support personnel, not a teacher
 - Supplemental addition to the Tier 1 curriculum
 1. Phonological Awareness and Alphabet Knowledge
 2. Vocabulary and Comprehension
 - Follows a general, developmental progression based on previous evaluation of curricular skill acquisition
 - Storybook 1 focuses on “Recognizing rhyming words
 - Storybook 9 focuses on Identification and production of initial sounds in words
- (Ziolkowski & Goldstein, 2008).



Tier 3 Interventions for Preschool Children

- ❖ Who will receive Tier 3 support?
 - Children who display significant delay in language/early literacy compared to peers
 - Children who are not making adequate progress in T2
- ❖ What do we know about these children?
 - Lowest performing children benefit the most from language and early literacy intervention that is:
 - Focused on a few priority skills
 - More explicit
 - More comprehensive
 - More systematic
 - *May include children who are receiving ECSE*
 - *May include children who are NOT receiving ECSE*

	<h2>Tier 3 Interventions for Preschool Children</h2>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ To be effective and feasible, Tier 3 interventions should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be delivered by a teacher ▪ Focus on the essential elements/critical skills ▪ Teach skills in optimum sequence ▪ Teach in ways that are fun, stimulating, engaging ▪ Provide variations and scaffolds to support diverse learning needs ▪ Provide supplemental activities/materials to support what is taught <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Tier 1 extensions ■ Writing activities 	

	<h2>Tier 3 Interventions for Preschool Children</h2>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ BRIEF activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brief (5-15 minute) ▪ Reading-related activities in domains of phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, vocabulary and oral language, and comprehension that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intense, e.g., small group size, carefully designed sequence of skills, increased opportunities for guided practice with teacher support; ▪ Engaging, e.g., inclusion of movement, songs, games appropriate for preschool children; and ▪ Focused on prerequisite and highest priority skills 	



Measurement Activities in EC RTI

❖ Who?

- All children are screened several times per year
- Those below benchmark receive Tier 2 and/or 3 intervention
- Children receiving Tier 2 and 3 supports are measured more frequently to assess progress



Measurement Activities in EC Rtl

❖ What?

- ❖ Progress Monitoring Measurement Standards insure that measures used (National Center for Student Progress Monitoring):
 - Are valid and reliable
 - Come with alternate forms
 - Have growth norms (age-based benchmarks) that define expected rates of progress
 - Promote teacher planning and frequent changes in intervention
 - Are sensitive to child improvement over time



Measurement Activities in EC RtI

- ❖ EC RTI progress monitoring measurement is
 - Focused on the outcome or domain of interest
 - Authentic, using naturalistic tasks and situations
 - Brief and repeatable
 - Implementable by early interventionists, teachers, and parents
 - Readily understandable by both parents and practitioners



Measurement Activities in EC RtI

- ❖ How
 - In a systematic plan for regular
 - Universal screening of all children
 - Progress monitoring of children needing and receiving more intensive services
 - With decision making occurring frequently with respect to child progress or lack of progress
 - Children continue level of service or move to either a more intensive (Tier 3) or less intensive (Tier 1) service based on progress (DEC, 2007).



Putting it all together in Real-World Classrooms

- ❖ While this complement of intervention and measurement strategies being employed in EC RTI are similar to many that are the mainstay of ECSE, they are new to Early Education
- ❖ The role of ECSE is vast, just three examples are
 - Supporting differentiation and individualization of instructional intervention
 - Providing intensive supports and services
 - Use of collaboration models



Myths surrounding EC RTI

- ❖ *Myths have developed about*
 - ❖ *What is EC RTI?*
 - ❖ *How to implement EC RTI?*
- ❖ *Myths have developed because*
 - ❖ *Few clearly defined and evaluated EC RTI models*
 - ❖ *No federal guidelines yet exist for implementation*



Early Childhood RTI Myths


- ❖ *Myth 2: RTI necessarily delays referral, eligibility, or the onset of special education services*
- ❖ *Myth 3: Rtl consists of 3 tiers of increasingly individualized instruction with children with disabilities being in Tier 3.*
- ❖ *Myth 4: Evidence-based curricula and instructional practices are available to support the implementation of Rtl approaches in early education.*



Dispelling Myths Table Activity


- ❖ Consider the myth assigned to your table
- ❖ Consider its accuracy/inaccuracy
- ❖ Is it a myth or a fact?
- ❖ How do you support your decision?
- ❖ Report out

- ❖ Refer to Handout #1



Survey of States: National EC RTI Implementation

- ❖ Task: Annual Survey of States
- ❖ Goal: Track State Progress Implementing Preschool RTI
- ❖ Survey Respondents:
 - 619 State Coordinators
 - PreK State Coordinators
- ❖ 2009 Summary Method
 - Web-based Survey
 - Sent to Coordinators in 54 States, US Territories, and Entities (e.g., Bureau of Indian Affairs)
 - Response Rate = 43 (80%), Not Responding 11 (20%)




2009 National EC RTI Implementation Status


Implementation Level	Percentage
1. No discussion nor implementation of EC RtI models has begun.	14.0
2. Some preliminary discussions are taking place.	43.9
3. Some professional development has begun to introduce the concept of RtI.	15.8
4. Some local programs have begun to implement RtI models in pre-K settings.	21.1
5. We have explicit written statewide RTI policies about RtI in early education settings, some programs have begun to implement.	3.5
6. We have fully implemented RtI in programs across our state.	1.8
Note: Based on 43 States, Territories, and Entities Reporting. 11 did not report	



What Programs are Implementing?




What Curricula are Involved?






What RTI Components are Involved?



Are there Promising, Innovative RTI Models You Can Share?





Many challenges were identified for implementing RtI in Early Childhood

CHALLENGE Level: (1 = None, 3= Moderate, 4 = Significant)

	<u>Mean Rating</u>
1. Insufficiently trained personnel	3.5
2. Lack of resources	3.2
3. Lack of knowledge for creating a RtI model	3.2
4. Lack of Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies	3.0
5. Lack of progress monitoring tools	3.0
6. Lack of evidence-based Tier 1	2.7
7. Lack of administrative support or leadership	2.7
8. Collaboration between EC and ESE systems	2.6



Summary of general trends

- ❖ States are beginning to have discussion about RtI and are introducing the concept in professional development.
- ❖ Most programs likely to be implementing RtI
 - ❖ Early childhood special education
 - ❖ State-funded pre-k programs
- ❖ Programs are applying RtI
 - ❖ Early literacy/ language
 - ❖ Social/behavioral



EC RTI Challenges Table Activity

- ❖ RTI Challenges to Rate
 - Insufficient trained personnel who could implement the components of RtI.
 - Lack of knowledge about how to put together an RtI model in early childhood.
 - Lack of evidence-based Tier 1 programs
 - Lack of administrative support and leadership
 - Lack of intervention strategies for Tier 2 or Tier 3
 - Lack of progress monitoring measures
 - Difficulty in establishing collaborative relationships between early education and special education systems
 - Lack of resources for developing an infrastructure to implement a RtI model



RTI Challenges Table Activity

1. What has changed since April 2009 in your state relative to these challenges?
2. Excluding funding and insufficient personnel, what do you find to be the 2 to 3 current top challenges?
3. Where/how is the starting point to resolve them?
4. Report out
5. Refer to Handout #2



Discussion

- ❖ Summing up EC RTI
 - It is a system approach inclusive of ALL children
 - EC RTI promises better results of all children
 - It is an emerging approach
 - Some states are discussing and providing PD
 - Evidence-based tools, procedures, and models are emerging
 - Policies are lacking
 - Challenges are many
 - ECSE has a critical role to play
- ❖ Discussion, Q & A



Web Pages of Interest!

- ❖ Home page <http://www.crtiec.org/>
- ❖ EC RTI Myths
<http://www.crtiec.org/RTI/documents/MythsaboutRtlinEarlyChildhood-Final9-1-09.pdf>
- ❖ US Survey Results http://www2.ku.edu/~crtiec/cgi-bin/RTI_Initiatives/RTI_Map.php
- ❖ Join RTI Network http://www.crtiec.org/~crtiec/cgi-bin/contact/join_network.php
- ❖ 2009 RTI Summit
http://www.crtiec.org/rti_summit/index.shtml



References

- DEC. (2007). *Promoting positive outcomes for children with disabilities: Recommendations for curriculum, assessment, and program evaluation*. Missoula, MT: Author.
- McConnell, S. R., Kaminski, R., Goldstein, H., Carta, J. J., & Greenwood, C. R. (2009, October) *Response to intervention in early childhood*. Research to practice roundtable presented at the 25th Annual Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Conference, Albuquerque, NM.
- National Center for Student Progress Monitoring (2009). Retrieved December 3, 2009 from <http://www.studentprogress.org/default.asp>
- Ziolkowski, R. A., & Goldstein, H. (2008). *Effects of an embedded phonological awareness intervention during repeated book reading on preschool children with language delays*. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 31, 67-90.
- CEC (2007). *RTI Position Statement*. Online at <http://www.cec.sped.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&CONTENTID=9237&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm>
- CEC (2009). *News and issues: Response to Intervention*. Retrieved June 30, 2009 from http://www.cec.sped.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Response_to_Intervention&Template=/TaggedPage/TaggedPageDisplay.cfm&TPLID=37&ContentID=8363



Handout 1: Dispelling myths table activity

1. Consider the myth assigned to your table
2. Discuss its accuracy/inaccuracy
3. Is it a myth or a fact (What do we Know)?
4. How do you support your Conclusion?
5. *Myths to Discuss!*
 - ❖ *Myth 2: RTI necessarily delays referral, eligibility, or the onset of special education services*
 - ❖ *Myth 3: RTI consists of 3 tiers of increasingly individualized instruction with children with disabilities being in Tier 3.*
 - ❖ *Myth 4: Evidence-based curricula and instructional practices are available to support the implementation of RTI approaches in early education.*



Handout 2: Challenges table activity

1. What has changed since April 2009 in your state relative to these challenges?
2. Excluding funding and insufficient personnel, what do you find to be the 2 to 3 current top challenges?
3. Where is the starting point and how can we resolve them?
 - Insufficiently trained personnel
 - Lack of resources
 - Lack of knowledge for creating a Rtl model
 - Lack of Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies
 - Lack of progress monitoring tools
 - Lack of evidence-based Tier 1
 - Lack of administrative support or leadership
 - Collaboration between EC and ESE systems



Handout 1: Dispelling myths table activity

1. Consider the myth assigned to your table
2. Discuss its accuracy/inaccuracy
3. Is it a myth or a fact (What do we Know)?
4. How do you support your Conclusion?
5. *Myths to Discuss!*
 - ❖ *Myth 2: RTI necessarily delays referral, eligibility, or the onset of special education services*
 - ❖ *Myth 3: RTI consists of 3 tiers of increasingly individualized instruction with children with disabilities being in Tier 3.*
 - ❖ *Myth 4: Evidence-based curricula and instructional practices are available to support the implementation of RTI approaches in early education.*



Handout 2: Challenges table activity

1. What has changed since April 2009 in your state relative to these challenges?
2. Excluding funding and insufficient personnel, what do you find to be the 2 to 3 current top challenges?
3. Where is the starting point and how can we resolve them?
 - Insufficiently trained personnel
 - Lack of resources
 - Lack of knowledge for creating a Rtl model
 - Lack of Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies
 - Lack of progress monitoring tools
 - Lack of evidence-based Tier 1
 - Lack of administrative support or leadership
 - Collaboration between EC and ESE systems