Enhancing Instructional Problem Solving

An Efficient System for Assisting Struggling Learners

JOHN C. BEGENY
ANN C. SCHULTE
KENT JOHNSON

THE GUILFORD PRESS
New York London

A Division of Guilford Publications, Inc.
72 Spring Street, New York, NY 10012
www.guilford.com

Printed in the United States of America

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Last digit is print number: 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Begeny, John C.
Enhancing instructional problem solving : an efficient system for assisting struggling learners / by John C. Begeny, Ann C. Schulte, and Kent Johnson.
pages cm. — (The Guilford practical intervention in the schools series)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4625-0477-0 (pbk.: alk. paper)
1. Response to intervention (Learning disabled children) 2. Learning disabled children—Education 3. Remedial teaching. I. Schulte, Ann C., 1955– II. Johnson, Kent R. III. Title.
LC4705.B45 2012
371.9—dc23

2012002509

TABLE 12.2. Intervention Programs for Reading

Name of program	Grade level	Primary content and activities	Possible secondary benefits[a]	Protocols for instruction	Lesson number	Lesson duration	TAs and volunteers can implement?[b]	Forms for monitoring implementation?	Progress monitoring materials?	Learner-verified?[c]
Intervention programs for phonemic awareness plus										
Earobics Connections	2–12	Phonemic awareness, phonics, language		Detailed teacher materials	Software; 6 interactive games, 600 levels	Varies	Yes, with training	Yes	Yes	Yes
Earobics Foundations	K–1	Phonemic awareness, phonics, language		Detailed teacher materials	Software; 5 interactive games, 300 levels	Teacher determines	Yes, with training	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fast ForWord	K–3	Alphabetic principle activities, phonemic awareness, fluency	Comprehension	Detailed teacher materials	Software, 5 days/week	30–100 minutes/day, 4–16 weeks	No	Yes	No	Yes
Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing Program (LiPS)	K–5	Segmenting, blending, tongue and mouth movements	Phonics	Detailed teacher materials	Not applicable	40–50 minutes	No	No	No	Yes
PALS Reading	K–6, 9–12	Phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, retelling	Comprehension	Scripted lessons, detailed teacher materials	600 lessons, 3 times/week	30–35 minutes	Yes, with training	Yes	Yes	Yes
Phonological Coding: Phonemic Awareness	K–3	Segmenting, blending, auditory discrimination	Phonics	Detailed teacher materials	14 fluency units	20 minutes	No	Placement test and charts	Easily constructed	No

TABLE 12.2. *(cont.)*

Name of program	Grade level	Primary content and activities	Possible secondary benefits[a]	Protocols for instruction	Lesson number	Lesson duration	TAs and volunteers can implement?[b]	Forms for monitoring implementation?	Progress monitoring materials?	Learner-verified?[c]
Intervention programs for reading fluency										
Great Leaps	K–5	Fluency (modeling, error correction, feedback with graphing), phonics	Phonics	Semiscripted lessons	100+ sequenced lessons and passages	10–12 minutes, 3–5 times/week	Yes, with training	No	Yes	No
HELPS (Helping Early Literacy with Practice Strategies)	1–8	Fluency (repeated reading, modeling, error correction, feedback with graphing, verbal cuing, goal setting), comprehension retell	Phonics, comprehension	Scripted lessons, detailed teacher materials	100 sequenced lessons and passages	10–12 minutes, 3 times/week	Yes, with training	Yes	Yes	Yes
Read Naturally	1–8	Fluency (modeling, repeated reading, feedback with graphing, goal setting), phonics (for early levels), comprehension questions	Writing, comprehension	Detailed teacher materials and computerized option for student-only learning	100+ sequenced lessons and passages within multiple levels and multiple programs	30–60 minutes, 3–5 times/week	Yes, with training, but may not be able to implement all steps	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE 12.3. Intervention Programs for Mathematics

Name of program	Grade level	Primary content and activities	Possible secondary benefits[a]	Protocols for instruction	Lesson number	Lesson duration	TAs and volunteers can implement?[b]	Forms for monitoring implementation?	Progress monitoring materials?	Learner-verified?[c]
Accelerated Math	1–12	Comprehensive standard curriculum		Detailed teacher materials and resources for each grade level	75–300 objectives per grade level	Varies	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hot Math Tutoring	3–6	Addition–subtraction word problems		Detailed teacher materials	39 lessons 3 times/week, 13 weeks	30 minutes	Yes, with training	Yes	No	Yes
Math Boardwork Procedures	K–8	Tool skills, computation skills, standard word problem solving		Detailed teacher resources	Not applicable	Varies depending on teacher preference	No	No	No	No
Morningside Math: Basic Number Skills (2 vols.)	K–6	Tool skills: number reading and writing, through nine digits		Teacher materials	10 lessons	20 minutes	Yes, with training	No	Easily constructed	No
Morningside Math: Math Facts (5 vols.)	1–8	Math facts	Computation	Detailed teacher materials	32 lessons	20 minutes	Yes, with training	No	Easily constructed	No

TABLE 6.2. *(cont.)*

Probe set type	Available from	Number of probes for progress monitoring, grade levels offered	Graphing and data display resources?
Mathematics computation	AIMSweb	33, K–8	Yes
	Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP)	30, 1–6	No
Mathematics concepts and applications	AIMSweb	33, K–8	Yes
	MBSP	30, 2–6	No
	Writing and spelling		
Prompts for writing stories	AIMSweb	94, grade independent	Yes
Spelling	AIMSweb	33, 1–8	Yes

Note. This table presents a sampling of CBM probe sets. Each individual probe set identified in the table has administration and training materials that accompany it, and score interpretation information related to use of the probe set for universal screening and progress monitoring.

ing students who are receiving help learning to associate graphemes (written letters) and sounds and to blend sounds. However, if the intervention program includes phonics skills beyond those used to blend CVC and VC combinations, nonsense word fluency is not likely to reflect changes in children's skill level when they progress beyond CVC words (McMaster, Fuchs, Fuchs, & Compton, 2005).

For this reason, one of the most useful measures for monitoring intervention programs targeted at skills to be mastered in the first grade is word identification fluency (Fuchs et al., 2004). Each probe in a word identification fluency CBM contains a list of words encountered across the year in first-grade reading instruction. The range of words increases the likelihood that the measure will be sensitive to increases in phonics and sight word skills for the entire first-grade year, unlike nonsense word fluency. However, the easier words on the word identification probes mean that the measure can be used before first graders acquire enough reading skills to allow use of a passage reading fluency CBM.

Passage Reading Fluency. When using passage reading fluency CBMs (described earlier) for progress monitoring, a set of CBM probes at the student's instructional level is used to gauge progress. Although passage reading fluency probes are a good general outcome measure of reading for students who are reading at the late first- to third-grade level, it is important to consider the time-limited relationship between passage reading fluency and reading comprehension. Passage reading fluency is more strongly related to reading comprehension in early grades than upper grades (Wiley & Deno, 2005). As students become skilled decoders of text (e.g., by fourth grade for an average or above-average reader), the relationship between comprehension and oral reading fluency becomes less strong (Paris, 2011). Switching to a reading CBM that more directly taps reading comprehension skill, such as the next type of probe to be described, may be desirable in fourth grade and above (Hosp, Hosp, & Howell, 2007). However, there are many situations where passage reading fluency probes may provide useful information in the upper grades, particularly

APPENDIX L

TAPS Summative Review of Intervention Effectiveness Form (SRF)

Student name: _____ Date of meeting: _____

Individuals present during the meeting: _____

Is date of meeting within 2 weeks of the date specified on Item 14 of Goal 3 on the TAPS IPF? (check one): ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If the response above is "No," state why: _____

Academic area targeted for intervention (check one): ☐ **Reading** ☐ **Writing** ☐ **Math**

Primary skill(s) targeted during intervention (and name of intervention program, if applicable): _____

_____

Number of intervention sessions implemented up to this date: _____

Number of weeks student was in school since intervention start date: _____

Indicate the student's goal (specified in Item 13 of the IPF) and student's current academic performance related to that goal: _____

_____

Intervention Effectiveness Summary

1. The intervention successfully addressed the primary concern (check one and then describe details and relevant assessment data to support your response):

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

_____

_____

_____

2. The student should receive additional services in the same academic area subskill(s) targeted for intervention (check one and then describe your rationale):

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

_____

_____

_____

3. The student should receive additional intervention services in the same academic area, but different subskill(s) (check one and then describe your rationale):

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

_____

_____

_____

(cont.)

4. Students with the same skill-area deficit would likely benefit from the same intervention program (check one and then describe your rationale):

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

_____

_____

_____

☐ ***Check this box to indicate that the TAPS Case Rating Scale has been completed.***

Intervention Implementation Summary

5. Average implementation integrity of the intervention program across all sessions and implementers: _____% *(Write "NA" if not applicable.)*

For Items 6–12, rate the degree to which the component of the overall intervention plan was implemented according to the student's TAPS IPF. If your rating is not "Agree" or "Strongly Agree," indicate the reason(s) for this using the following list, "Reasons for deviating from the intended intervention plan," and write comments as needed.

Reasons for deviating from the intended intervention plan, as specified in the student's TAPS IPF:

a) Plan described in the TAPS IPF was unclear to one or more individuals implementing the component.
b) Due to school and/or classroom scheduling challenges, there was insufficient time to always complete the component.
c) Student needed academic or behavioral support beyond expected levels, which minimized opportunities to always complete the component.
d) Implementer had insufficient training or knowledge to always complete the component.
e) High level of student or implementer absences—specify number of absences and who (implementer or student) had the high level of absences.
f) Inadequate space and/or resources within the school to always complete the component.
g) Other reasons—explain the reason(s) on the respective lines.

6. Intervention program procedures were implemented with integrity (if rating = 3 or less, write corresponding number[s] for reason[s]: ___)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

7. All Implementers were well trained, as intended (if rating = 3 or less, write corresponding number[s] for reason[s]: _)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

(cont.)

8. Intervention program was implemented the minimum number of weeks stated (if rating = 3 or less, write corresponding number[s] for reason[s]: ___)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

9. Per day, the intervention program was implemented the minimum number of minutes stated (if rating = 3 or less, write number[s] for reason[s]: _____)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

10. Implementation integrity of intervention program was evaluated as intended (if rating = 3 or less, write corresponding number[s] for reason[s]: ___)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

11. Progress monitoring assessments occurred as intended (if rating = 3 or less, write corresponding number[s] for reason[s]: ___)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

12. Periodic follow-up meetings occurred as intended (if rating = 3 or less, write corresponding number[s] for reason[s]: ___)

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

13. Deviations of the intervention plan (such as deviations possibly noted above) weakened the success of the plan (check one and describe, if needed):

☐ 1–Strongly Disagree ☐ 2–Disagree ☐ 3–Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ 4–Agree ☐ 5–Strongly Agree

Explain reason if needed: _____

_____

14. Describe successes related to implementing the intervention plan: _____

_____

_____

(cont.)

Summary of Next Steps

What steps should now be taken? Check all that apply and write additional information that describes how the classroom teacher, the TAPS Teacher, and/or other school professionals will proceed to ensure positive learning outcomes for the student.

- ☐ 1. Discontinue all intervention program(s) described in TAPS IPF.
- ☐ 2. Monitor student's academic performance every _____ week(s) with assessment (specify frequency on the given line).
- ☐ 3. Continue implementing the intervention program(s) described in the current TAPS IPF; on lines below, specify frequency, duration, etc.
- ☐ 4. Modify the intervention program(s) described in the TAPS IPF; on lines below, specify how the program will be modified.
- ☐ 5. Begin a new intervention program that addresses the same skill; on lines below, specify the new intervention program and rationale for new intervention.
- ☐ 6. Modify the intervention plan (other than the specified intervention program); on lines below, specify how the plan will be modified.
- ☐ 7. Develop and implement an intervention that specifically addresses student behavior/motivation; on lines below, describe basic aspects of the intervention.
- ☐ 8. Seek additional problem-solving support from other school staff; on lines below, specify who, how, why, and related details.
- ☐ 9. Conduct a thorough student assessment to improve instructional problem solving; on lines below, describe details (when, what assessments, why, etc.).
- ☐ 10. Have classroom teacher request assistance regarding a different academic area or subskill; on lines below, describe the teacher's new concerns.
- ☐ 11. Other; describe on lines below.