Despense to Intervention.	0	1	2	3			
Response-to Intervention:	No skills or	Beginning	Partially	Fully			
Mathematics	knowledge/	to learn/	competent/	competent/			
Mathematics	not in place	put in place	in place	in place			
School Syste							
☐ Principal supports Response-to-Intervention (Rtl)							
model in mathematics							
☐ Faculty and staff received an overview of the Rtl							
model as applied to mathematics							
☐ Majority (80+%) of faculty and staff support the							
use of an Rtl model in mathematics							
☐ Multi-disciplinary problem-solving teams have							
been formed (e.g., building, grade, combination) in order to evaluate data; establish building, grade,							
class, individual student goals; select curricula and							
interventions; select tools for screening and							
monitoring progress; evaluate outcomes							
☐ Resources currently available are inventoried							
(e.g., curricula/programs/interventions, personnel,							
materials, time)							
☐ Expert(s) in mathematics or mathematics							
instruction (e.g., mathematics coaches,							
mathematics teachers, mathematics department							
heads, university level mathematicians) are							
included on district and building level problem-							
solving teams	1 D '- ' 1	.					
Data-Based Decision Making							
Universal Screening							
☐ Select screening measures reflective of grade							
level content standards [e.g., map onto NCTM							
(2006) focal points, NMAP (2008) recommendations, and Common Core (2010)]							
☐ Select screening measures that are reliable,							
valid (predictive validity), efficient							
☐ Same screening measures are used across							
district							
☐ Screening is conducted with all students 2 or 3							
times yearly (fall, winter, spring)							
☐ Screening data are used in combination with							
state testing results (recommended for grades 4 to							
8)							
Progress Monitoring							
☐ Students receiving Tier 2 & 3 services are							
monitored weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly using							
grade-level general outcome measures ☐ Students slightly above cut-off score are							
monitored (recommendation: one standard error of							
measurement above cut score) monthly							
☐ Use progress monitoring measures that are							
reliable, valid and designed to measure growth							
☐ Monitor progress for students receiving Tier 2 &							
3 services using curriculum-embedded or mastery							
measures daily or weekly to evaluate response to							
treatment							
☐ Use progress monitoring to determine when							
instructional changes or regrouping are needed			<u></u>				
High Quality Instruction; Aligned with Standards							

☐ Designated block of time is assigned for core						
mathematics instruction (recommendation 45 to 60						
minutes)						
☐ Select core curricula reflective of grade level						
content standards [e.g., map onto NCTM (2006)						
focal points, NMAP (2008) recommendations, and						
Common Core (2010)]						
☐ Include instructional process components like						
peer-tutoring or cooperative learning activities						
☐ Independent practice activities (class- and						
home-work) are provided for content that can be						
completed with a minimum of 80% accuracy						
Tiered Interventions						
☐Tiered instruction/intervention, in addition to core						
instruction, is provided for enrichment (students at						
or above expectations on screening measures),						
support (small group Tier 2 intervention), and						
intensive support (individualized/smaller group Tier						
3 intervention)						
□20-40 minutes is scheduled 4 to 5 times weekly						
for tiered instruction/intervention (more may be						
designated for Tier 3)						
☐ Range of professionals, staff, & volunteers are						
identified as Interventionists (e.g., professionals						
with specialized training often reserved for Tier 3						
services)						
☐Tier 2 & 3 interventions should include instruction						
that is explicit and systematic (e.g., modeling,						
demonstration, verbalization of thought process –						
think aloud, guided practice, corrective feedback,						
and frequent cumulative review)						
☐Tier 2 & 3 interventions emphasize foundation						
and prerequisite skills						
☐Tier 2 & 3 interventions focus on deep						
understanding of and proficiency with whole						
numbers (grades K to 5)						
☐Tier 2 & 3 intervention materials should include						
visual representation of mathematics concepts						
☐Tier 2 & 3 interventions should include 10						
minutes of math fact fluency building						
☐Tier 2 & 3 interventions should include						
motivational strategies						
☐Scripted protocols are used or developed to						
enhance treatment integrity						
Professional Development & Support						
□Coaches or consultants are identified to provide	•					
training to interventionists, continuous feedback						
and support, and evaluate treatment integrity						
□Interventionists are trained in specific intervention						
protocols with added emphasis on using multiple						
types of visual representations to illustrate						
mathematics concepts (especially problem solving)						
□In-service and ongoing training						
(coaching/consulting) and support for classroom						
teachers on core curricula is identified, developed,						
and scheduled						

References

- Gersten, R., Beckmann, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., & Witzel, B. (2009). Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (Rtl) for elementary and middle schools (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/.
- Shapiro, E. S. (2012). New thinking in Response to Intervention: A comparison of computeradaptive tests and curriculum-based measurement within Rtl. Washington Rapids: Renaissance Learning, Inc.
- Slavin, R. E. & Lake, C. (2008). Effective programs in mathematics: A best evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 427-515.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., & Groff, C. (2009). Effective programs in middle and high school mathematics: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 839-911. doi:10.3102/0034654308330968
- Stein, M., Kinder, D., Zapp,, K., & Feuerborn, L. *Promoting positive math outcomes*. In M. R. Shinn & H. W. Walker (Eds.), Interventions for achievement and behavior problems in a three-tier model including Rtl (pp. 527-551). Bethesda, MD: NASP.
- Wright, J. (2011). Response-to-Intervention school readiness survey. Retrieved from www.jimwrightonlin.com/php/rti/rti_wire.php.