

## RTI Implementation Status Checklist

	Not in Place	Limited Practice	Partially Implemented	Well Established	Don't Know
<b>Parent Involvement</b>					
All parents are provided <b>information regarding the RTI framework</b> and what it means for them and their child.					
Communication with families exists in a <b>language</b> or mode that is meaningful to them.					
<b>Parents are notified</b> about their child's performance on schoolwide assessments.					
There is <b>meaningful communication</b> between families and staff about all students' strengths and needs—and additional collaboration when concerns are identified.					
Parents are notified when their <b>child begins a supplemental</b> (Tier 2 or 3) intervention.					
Parents are provided with a <b>description of assurances</b> of what general education problem solving will provide (for example, intervention plan, timelines, data to be collected, decision-making rules).					
<b>Parent participation</b> in the problem-solving process is solicited.					
Parents are provided with materials and training in the provision of curricular <b>supports in the home setting</b> when appropriate.					
Parents of children who receive interventions at any tier are provided reports on their child's interventions, goals, and <b>progress toward their goals</b> .					
Parents are informed of their <b>right to request</b> a special education evaluation.					
<b>Comments:</b>					

School Climate and Culture	Not in Place	Limited Practice	Partially Implemented	Well Established	Don't Know
All educators have attended an <b>overview presentation</b> of the RTI framework that included information on implications for curriculum and instruction, assessment practices, and schoolwide organization and problem solving.					
All educators understand how the <b>RTI framework is represented</b> in their building (including implications for curriculum, assessment, and organization).					
All educators understand that RTI is a buildingwide framework designed to <b>benefit all students</b> , not solely or primarily related to special education.					
Building or district leadership <b>demonstrate active commitment</b> to and support of the RTI framework.					
Educators feel <b>shared responsibility</b> and play meaningful roles in ongoing activities to sustain the RTI framework.					
<b>Research-based practices</b> are understood and accepted by educators and are consistently incorporated within classroom instruction.					
Educators are committed to <b>ongoing professional development</b> regarding research-based practices and instruction of diverse learners.					
<b>Consultation, feedback, and collegial exchange</b> about curriculum, instruction, and behavioral expectations are supported by administration and valued by educators.					
Sufficient time and resources are allocated to <b>professional development</b> and related activities in support of the RTI framework components.					
All educators understand the <b>roles and responsibilities</b> of their colleagues to maximize capacity for student support.					
<b>Shared responsibility</b> for all children is evident among educators.					
<b>Expectations</b> for academic performance and positive behavior have been agreed on and shared with all stakeholders.					
Educators believe that <b>communication with families</b> and community is an integral part of their jobs.					
<b>Growth and learning is celebrated</b> with members of the school and community, and with families.					
<b>Comments:</b>					

Curriculum and Instruction	Not in Place	Limited Practice	Partially Implemented	Well Established	Don't Know
There are clear, high-quality core curricula in academic and social behavior areas implemented with <b>well-defined scope and sequence</b> plans across grades.					
Teachers are <b>well trained</b> to implement core curricula.					
Ongoing work to <b>align</b> the core curricula with state standards is evident.					
Universal <b>screening results are linked</b> to ongoing discussions about high-quality core curriculum for academics <i>and</i> social behavior.					
The district has a plan for systematically evaluating the <b>fidelity</b> of core curriculum implementation on a regular basis and addressing deficiencies.					
Systematic <b>evaluation of the effectiveness</b> of core instruction is conducted on a regular basis.					
Teachers are knowledgeable about and implement principles of <b>effective instruction</b> (high rates of engagement, opportunities to respond, immediate error corrections, and so on).					
Teachers are knowledgeable about and implement research-based principles for effective instruction in <b>basic skill areas</b> (reading, writing, and math).					
Teachers understand how to embed basic skills instruction within <b>content area classes</b> and do this regularly.					
School <b>schedules</b> allow for maximum use of resources in the core classes (for example, through flexible grouping) and for daily, tiered supplemental intervention time.					
The school has <b>evidence-based curricula</b> , instruction, or strategies identified for tiered intervention supports of increasing intensity.					
Criteria and procedures for <b>moving between tiers</b> of intervention are set.					
Instructional staff members are <b>trained</b> in interventions to be used.					
Systematic <b>evaluation of the effectiveness</b> of supplemental, tiered instruction is conducted on a regular basis.					
By combining high-quality core instruction with intensive tiered supports, the school has a plan to <b>accelerate learning</b> for all at-risk students so they meet grade-level standards in one to two years.					
<b>Comments:</b>					

Measurement and Assessment	Not in Place	Limited Practice	Partially Implemented	Well Established	Don't Know
The school or district has a clearly articulated local assessment plan that includes <b>screening procedures</b> for all students at least three times per year; <b>diagnostic assessment</b> as needed; a plan for <b>progress monitoring</b> those at risk; and <b>outcomes evaluation</b> at least annually.					
The measures identified in the local assessment plan are all <b>reliable and valid</b> for the purposes for which they are used.					
Professionals are trained to a high degree of reliability in the <b>standard administration and scoring</b> of all assessments used.					
<b>Fidelity</b> of assessment administration and scoring procedures are evaluated on a regular basis, and refresher trainings are provided as needed.					
Data are stored in a <b>database</b> that is easily accessible by all teachers and administrators in a timely manner.					
Educators understand and can communicate about the <b>purposes and value</b> of the assessments used, as well as their limitations.					
Educators are skilled at <b>interpreting assessment results</b> and making decisions based on these results.					
Schoolwide assessment data are used to evaluate the <b>effectiveness of core</b> academic and behavior programs.					
Schoolwide assessment data are used to <b>identify students</b> who may be at risk in academic or social-behavioral areas.					
<b>Diagnostic assessments</b> occur as needed to better understand specific needs of identified at-risk students.					
Schedules for <b>progress monitoring</b> are set based on the intensity of students' needs, and assessment occurs at least monthly for all identified students.					
Teachers regularly use data from progress monitoring to drive <b>instructional decisions</b> throughout the continuum of supports.					
Educators conduct an <b>outcomes evaluation</b> at least once per year to identify areas of strength and need for continuous program improvement.					
<b>Comments:</b>					

<b>Collaborative Teams</b>	<b>Not in Place</b>	<b>Limited Practice</b>	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	<b>Well Established</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Grade-level, building-level, and district-level teams all consistently follow a <b>problem-solving process</b> to make data-based educational decisions that promote improvement in academic and social-behavioral outcomes for students.					
There is common understanding of the purpose and <b>unique roles</b> of each team within the building or district and of the ways in which these teams interrelate.					
All teams are viewed as having the primary mission and responsibility of supporting student success within <b>general education</b> and not as vehicles to promote special education identification.					
Team meetings at all levels are <b>regularly scheduled</b> , of sufficient duration, and frequent enough (monthly grade-level team meetings, weekly problem-solving team meetings) to complete necessary tasks. All members of teams regularly attend the meetings.					
<b>Grade-level teams</b> exist in grades 5–9 and include all general and special educators who serve students at each grade level.					
Building-based <b>problem-solving teams</b> exist and have balanced representation from all general and specialized teaching groups.					
Teachers who refer students to a problem-solving team <b>meet directly</b> with the team to discuss intervention options and plans.					
All team members are <b>trained</b> with regard to procedures, forms, and available resources for their team.					
Meeting <b>agendas</b> are clearly communicated and include goals and tasks.					
There is <b>effective facilitation/leadership</b> at each team meeting.					
The <b>building administrator</b> actively participates in team meetings.					
All team members attend regularly and <b>participate actively</b> during meetings.					
All teams <b>maintain records</b> on students they have served.					
<b>Effective communication</b> exists between teams.					
<b>Data on team functioning</b> are collected regularly (number of students served, fidelity to problem-solving process).					
<b>Comments:</b>					

<b>Problem-Solving Process</b>	<b>Not in Place</b>	<b>Limited Practice</b>	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	<b>Well Established</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Schoolwide <b>screening results</b> for academics and behavior are used to identify students for problem solving by grade-level or building-level teams.					
Team members effectively and efficiently <b>identify and prioritize problems</b> for every student or group of students served through intervention services.					
The prioritized problem for each student or group of students is observable, measurable, and described as a discrepancy between what is expected and what is occurring as measured on one assessment tool, with additional <b>converging evidence</b> from other sources.					
Teams generate multiple <b>hypotheses across domains</b> (ICEL) when considering the cause of the identified problem. These are relevant, alterable, and observable.					
Teams systematically analyze information from a <b>variety of sources</b> (RIOT) to support or refute each generated hypothesis.					
An individual, specific, and <b>measurable goal</b> is set for each student.					
Interventions selected by the problem-solving team are <b>supported by research</b> .					
Interventions selected by the problem-solving team <b>address the student need</b> identified in the discrepancy and hypothesis statements.					
Intervention plans are implemented in a <b>timely manner</b> .					
A plan to gather regular <b>progress-monitoring</b> data toward the student goal is a part of each intervention plan.					
<b>Intervention fidelity</b> is always assessed through direct observation, and any issues are quickly resolved.					
Intervention sessions are of sufficient intensity, duration, and frequency to <b>expect growth</b> .					
Student <b>responsiveness is evaluated</b> based on progress-monitoring data.					
Intervention plans are evaluated in a timely manner, and resulting <b>decisions are documented</b> .					
The team <b>cycles through</b> the problem-solving process again and again when students' performance is not sufficiently responsive to the current intervention.					
<b>Comments:</b>					