

What Counts as Evidence? Making Decisions for Instruction and Intervention within a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Webinar Transcript

[Slide 1 – Welcome: What Counts as Evidence? Making Decisions for Instruction and Intervention within a Multi-Tiered System of Support]: Sarah Arden: Okay everyone, we're going to go ahead and get started. Thank you so much for joining us and taking some time out of your day; to participate in our Webinar.

[Slide 2 – What Counts as Evidence? Making Decisions for Instruction and Intervention within a Multi-Tiered System of Support]: You should see the slides up on your Webinar page. And there are some handouts; we sent out a link earlier in the Chat Box. With a link to where the handouts and the slides are posted. If you have questions about those, go ahead and check that Chat Box and see if you have the link. There also, you can find a handouts section when you signed into the Webinar. So, you should be able to find everything there. If you have questions, go ahead and put those in the questions box and then we will do our best to help you.

So I just want to thank you again for our What Counts as Evidence Webinar.

[Slide 3 – Question Box]: Talking about making decisions for instruction and intervention within an MTSS system. We have a couple of great panelists with us and I'll introduce them in a second. But, you can see the slide up now. It gives you an image of where you can get support if you should need it. You can go ahead and direct any questions that you may have in there and one of our Webinar Team members will try to assist you as soon as possible to help you work through and make sure that you have access to everything that you need.

So, logistical components aside. I am excited to introduce our panelists that we have today. We've got Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds, Allison Gandhi and Lynn Holdheide on to talk to you about levels of evidence and making decisions in an MTSS framework.

[Slide 4 – Participant Poll]: And we're going to go ahead and move the slides forward. Before we get started, we want to get a sense of who is on with us. So, you should see a poll; a polling participant poll with some questions about who you are.

[Participant Poll – What role do you serve in supporting student learning?]: You'll see it over in the poll section. If you could tell us what role you have in supporting student learning? It takes a second or two for the polling information to come in. But, we want to know if you're a technical assistance provider? If you're faculty? If you're someone who is like a State or District School Administrator or if you're a teacher? Or if you're other. So, while you're polling; I am going to go ahead and watch the data come in. And after this poll comes in we'll get a sense of who is on with us and then I'll pass it over to Allison Gandhi who will begin the presentation.

And it looks like we have; almost half of you are teachers. Forty percent of you are teachers or school staff. And the next biggest percentage are State and District School Administrators. So, that's about seventy percent of who we have on with us. That information is really helpful and I'm going to go ahead and pass it over to Allison Gandhi who is going to get started with our presentation.

[Slide 5 – Today's Webinar: Goals]: Allison Gandhi: Great, thank you Sarah. Welcome everyone, we are really happy to be delivering this Webinar on what we think is a really important topic. And that is evidence. And just the different understandings of evidence that we all bring to our work. And as I'm sure you all know, the term evidence is being used more and more in discussions about education and the different instructional practices and interventions that we choose to implement.

And there is increasing pressures on practitioners at all levels to be implementing practices that are evidence-based. And different policies are holding people accountable for this. Meanwhile, while we don't really have a common understanding of what counts as evidence and how to make sure that we are making decisions that are grounded in through NCII, The CEEDAR Center as well as NCSI; The National Center on Systemic Improvement. We need to be able to support our audiences in making these decisions. So, today we want to share with you a framework in thinking about evidence and this framework is grounded in the framework of a Multi-Tiered System of Support or MTSS. And the reason why we're using MTSS as our framework is because we find that in our work when we do give guidance about evidence-based practices; the guidance that we give is different depending on whether we're talking about practices at Tier One, Tier Two or Tier Three.

So, the overall goal of this Webinar is to just primarily just to lessen the anxiety around evidence-based practices or EBPs as we're going to call them. And we wanted you to first find making the case that EBPs; or that there can or there should be some flexibility in how we define EBPs across the different Tiers in MTSS. Second, we want to share with you some resources that you can use to select EBPs that are appropriate to your needs.

And we're going to talk about resources in two ways. We're going to talk about core instructional practice. So, kind of what we would consider Tier One in MTSS. And then we'll talk about it also in terms of intervention. So, it is what we would consider Tiers Two and Three.

[Slide 6: Role of EBPs in Federal Policy]: So, I'm going to start by just describing some of the Federal requirements around EBPs in education. And first we have the Every Student Succeeds Act or ESSA which was just recently passed. And this law has some very specific language in in about how evidence should be used to support the selection of practices. So first of all, the law says that in their efforts to turn around low performing schools States need to implement evidence-based interventions. And second, the law actually includes language on different categories of evidence; which I have included on this slide.

So, strong evidence according to this law means that a practice is supported by at least one randomized study. This is really considered to be the most rigorous kind of evidence. Moderate evidence would mean that a practice is supported by at least one quasi-experimental study. Promising evidence means that a practice is supported by at least one correlational study with

pretests and covariates. And then there's a fourth category that really just says that there can be programs that have a rationale based on high quality research or a positive evaluation that shows that the practice is likely to improve students or other relevant outcomes.

And any intervention that a State would use to turn around its lowest performing schools, needs to have evidence that falls into at least one of the top three categories. So, you know we think that this is good guidance. Especially because it's really clear and it lays out what they mean by evidence. But, from our point of view there is still a problem in that there are many practices that are used in schools. And many of them are good practices but for various reasons, they don't lend themselves to the kinds of studies that are required to meet these really rigorous levels of evidence. Especially when you're talking about the strong evidence.

And so, we would argue that there needs to be a little bit of flexibility there and that's what we're going to be talking about today.

[Slide 7 – Role of EBPs in Federal Policy]: So, meanwhile; OSEP has recently launched the Results Driven Accountability Initiative or RDA. And what RDA does is it holds States accountable for not only compliance indicators. And by that I mean things like timely evaluations or disproportionality. But now, States are also being held accountable for student results. So, States need to develop and implement what's called a State Systemic Improvement Plan; otherwise known as the SSIP.

And in that plan, they have to identify a measurable child level outcome that's going to be their target that they have to achieve in the next three years. And this is called a State Identified Measurable Result or SiMR. This outcome; this result, the SiMR needs to be a child level outcome or if it's the Part C Program it could be a family level outcome. It can't be a process or a system result and it can be either a single result or something really narrow like fourth grade reading achievements. Or, it can be a cluster of related results; so something like reading achievement across multiple grades and it has to be based on an analysis of data.

[Slide 8 – EBPs in the SSIP]: So, the OSEP Guidance to States is that in their State Systemic Improvement Plans or SSIPs. States have to outline the specific interventions and practices that they will implement to achieve their SiMR. And these interventions need to be evidence-based.

[Slide 9 – EBPs in the SSIP]: Now, what's interesting however is the OSEP guidance around what it means to be evidence-based. It is a little bit less clear than SSIP. And really what they have said about it is that it really just needs to be based on the best available research. So, that does allow for some flexibility in terms of how you might interpret this. However; States do need to describe what the evidence is in their SSIPs. So there is a better need for understanding of what counts as evidence.

[Slide 10 – Challenge: They're everywhere, but what are they?]: Okay, so the difference between these two major federal policies that I just described in terms of how they define EBPs and the criteria for EBPs does illustrate one of the really major challenges that we see. And that is, inconsistent terminology and language. The question still sort of remains. What is an evidence-based practice? So as I just described, you have different language already in the ESSA and in RDA.

Also, some of you may be familiar with language that used to be in the NCLD. The term scientifically based research and some groups still use that term. And there are plenty of other sources of guidance out there already about EBPs as well. And they have different terms and definitions also. So for example; the What Works Clearinghouse which I'm sure a lot of you are familiar with. The CEC [Council for Exceptional Children] Quality Indicators; and really there are dozens of websites out there that have lists of EBPs.

And there are also commercial publishers. Who also put out their products and call them evidence-based or research based or promising. And there are many different terms and many different sources and it can all be very confusing to navigate.

[Slide 11 – Challenge: They're everywhere, but what are they?]: So, another source of inconsistency is the criteria that are used to determine a practice as evidence-based. So, all of these organizations that produce lists of EBPs use slightly different criteria. And some examples of the different factors that are considered include for example; the quality of the evidence. So, what is the design of the study that was conducted on a particular practice?

The second would be the direction of the results. Meaning did they get positive results or negative results and the magnitude or how big were the results? The third would just be how much evidence exists? How many studies have been conducted on this? And then fourth; sometimes it's important to consider the source of evidence. Are we talking about a practice that's only been researched by the developers of the practice or by an external evaluator?

And then, many of these organizations have some kind of combination of these criteria when determining whether a practice is evidence-based. So, as practitioners we need to make decisions about which of these organizations to trust and what do we value in terms or criteria for deciding that something is evidence-based.

[Slide 12 – Participant Poll]: So, we want to take a pause here and just put out a poll question. And we want you all to take a moment and think about what is most important to you.

[Participant Poll – What is the most important criteria for YOU when selecting an Evidence-Based practice?]: When you're choosing an evidence-based practice. So thinking about this, is important to you that it has examined using the most rigorous research design? Or is it important that it has a very large body of research showing positive results? Is it important that maybe the research is not a large body but, it's just never been shown to have negative results? Other criteria may just be that the practice has worked well for your kids.

You've seen it work or you've seen it work with your colleagues kids. Or, maybe it's just aligns very well to your students' needs. And it may be all of these things that are important to you and I'm sure it is. But, if you had to choose the most important thing; what would it be? So, if you can just take a moment to look through this poll question and then answer; that would be helpful.

Sarah Arden: It looks like about seventy-five percent of you have voted. And we are about sixty percent that says "has a large body of research." The second option showing positive and about twenty-seven percent with "the practice aligned to my student's needs." Everywhere else is about three to five percent.

Allison Gandhi: Great okay so that's actually really interesting. So it's interesting to hear that most people want to see that large body of research.

[Slide 12 – Participant Poll]: But I think the point here is just to show that you know there's a lot that goes into deciding that a practice is evidence-based. It's more than just having the most rigorously designed research study and we worry sometimes that we've gotten to the point where we're too rigid in terms of how we define EBPs.

[Slide 13 – Are we taking EBPs a bit too seriously?]: Okay so here on this slide; this is just a little example of an extreme situation. That you know that may be a little too extreme. But, to some degree it reflects a little bit of what's going on. A little bit of just taking them too seriously. So you know, here we have a teacher who is saying "well, I can tell that you're struggling with Fractions Tony but there aren't any EBPs for kids in your grade." So just check back in a few years.

[Slide 14 – Common EBP Questions]: Right, and this obviously is not realistic. You know if we don't have any EBPs available.

[Slide 13 – Are we taking EBPs a bit too seriously?]: For a particular topic, we can't just sit back and do nothing right? We have to have some alternatives.

[Slide 14 – Common EBP Questions]: So, it's really important for practitioners to understand not only what EBPs are but to also how can they benefit from them. Also, what are the rules for implementing them? You know to what extent can practitioners adapt them to meet their own specific needs in their context? And then if they do adapt them, how do they monitor the implementation and gather their own evidence so that they can be confident that it can still be effective?

Because, an evidence-based practice is really much more than just identifying something that's been validated through research. There's a lot more that happens after you take that practice and bring it into your classroom and adapt it and make sure that it's working for you.

[Slide 15 – ESSA and RDA]: Okay, so coming back to the federal policy discussion. We have a situation now where States are dealing with not necessarily conflicting guidance. But, definitely different guidance from these two laws or policies. Both in terms of why EBPs are required and also in the language that's used to describe what evidence-based means. And we see that as just a really big roadblock in terms of states being have an impact with their work.

So, what we find first of all is that sort of on one side you have the Special Education people. Sort of who are working on being compliant with RDA. So they're really going to focus on EBPs that are aligned with their particular goal; their SiMR. And they are going to focus on this idea of best available research. Right?

Then over on the general ed side, you have people who are focused on maybe more on low performing schools. And they needing to try to identify evidence-based interventions to implement in those schools. And they're going to be looking at interventions backed by really rigorous studies. Because, they want to follow the guidance and task lists. Right?

But meanwhile, these two groups really have the same aim which is just to get good practices in the schools to improve results for the lowest achieving students. But, we're finding a lot of times that these groups are having a lot of trouble talking to each other. And really, we think that that's just they have different frames of mind in terms that they're using around evidence-based practices. So, what we wanted to do is suggest some common language and a common framework to states and districts to use when thinking about these EBPs.

[Slide 16]: So, it occurred to us that MTSS could be a really useful framework to help stakeholders in our states come together around EBPs. And that was for a couple of reasons. So first, MTSS is just becoming so much more common. It actually comes up in the actually legislation several times as a strategy that is encouraged. Especially for addressing literacy. And we know that many states are looking at MTSS as an overall improvement strategy. So, it does have the potential to bring special educators and general educators together.

But, more importantly I think that MTSS is more helpful because; it is explicit about the fact that instruction is different across Tiers. And so, the practice that we're talking about when we say evidence-based practice is also going to be different. So, just going back to the language issue. We still have that question. Well, what is the practice? It's not really clear.

Are we talking about an intervention program? Are we talking about an instructional strategy? Or a process of some kind? And all of this language is really important because of the type of evidence that you need to feel confident that you're making a good choice is going to vary depending on what we mean by practice. And so we think that MTSS can help to clarify these things.

[Slide 17 – Characteristics of Intervention Levels/Tiers]: So on this slide, we have a table that details how we see the practice as being different in each Tier in MTSS. And I'm going to just walk through this. So, in the first Tier; so this is your primary level of MTSS. This is where you have your comprehensive research based curriculum. And what's important to note here is that at Tier One; we're not talking about packaged intervention programs. We're talking about a much broader curriculum that includes many different instructional strategies and practices that are brought together. And overall, the curriculum is also covering a specific range of content that is aligned to grade level standards. And this curriculum or instruction is delivered class wide. Usually at Tier One you're monitoring about once per term and you're serving all of your students.

Okay, moving to Tier Two. Now this is where we're talking more about those packaged intervention programs. These are more standardized programs that are targeting small groups of students. Typically between three to seven students. You would be progress monitoring at least once a month. And these are you're at risk students.

At Tier Three, now we're talking about individualized interventions that's based on student data. And what's really important to note here is that the practice at Tier Three is actually different for each single kid that you're working with. Right; so that makes it very difficult to take some sort of standard evidence-based practice and apply them.

[Slide 18]: So, now we're talking about usually one student at a time. You're progress monitoring at least weekly. And these are your students with the most intensive needs. So now

that we know sort of what are the varying ways in which a practice is defined by tiers? So what, does that mean for evidence?

[Slide 19 – Role of Evidence]: Okay so, this slide is sort of a summary of how we're thinking about how evidence might vary a little bit for each of the tiers. And my co-presenters are going to take this and talk about this in more detail. But, just to give you a preview and a summary. For Tier One again, this is our comprehensive research-based curriculum. When we think about what evidence we need for the practice here at Tier One, well we need to know first of all are we covering the critical content? And second we need to know and feel good that the instructional practices and strategies that we're using on their own each have evidence of efficacy.

When you move to Tier Two; now we're talking about the standardized interventions. Here we need to have evidence that first of all that the intervention is aligned to the skills that you are targeting. And then second, that the standardized program that you're working with itself has demonstrated efficacy.

And then the Third Tier, this is where we're talking about individualized instruction based on student data. Here, the evidence is really about that student data again. So, are you individualizing the intervention? And you're bringing in strategies and you're making all of these decisions based on frequent progress monitoring data that you're collecting? That's really the best evidence that you have at Tier Three.

And one thing; before I pass this on to the next presenter. One thing that I think is important to point out here is that at the Tier Two level, these are really the kinds of practices that lend themselves to those really high most rigorous standards of evidence. So, it's the kind of evidence that the What Works Clearinghouse and the ESSA are really talking about. So these are again those packaged programs that you can fairly easily implement with fidelity and because of that; you can test them with experimental studies.

And so these are the practices that are most likely to be labeled as EBPs. Because, for the most part the way that we understand EBPs right now is driven by these very rigorous levels of evidence. Now, on the other hand when you look at practices implemented at Tiers One and Three; so when you're talking about instructional strategies or this idea of individualizing an intervention based on data. You can't really conduct randomized control trials very easily on those kinds of practices because they vary so much and they're kind of fluid.

But that of course does not mean that these are not important practiced to implement. So, we just need to be more flexible in thinking about. Again it is what counts as evidence at Tiers One and Three? So, that's what my co-presenters are going to talk about a little bit more.

[Slide 20 – Core Instructional Practice]: And I'm going to pass this over first to Lynn Holdheide who is going to talk about core instructional practice.

Lynn Holdheide: Thanks you Allison, what a very nice set up. And thank you all again for joining us this afternoon. I am excited and in some ways validated to see such an interest in this topic. So, I think it's important to know my perspective as we enter into the piece about Tier One or core instruction and what perspective I'm coming from.

I am a special education teacher at heart. I spent a lot of my career in secondary transition and preparing students for the adult world that awaits them. But a couple; about ten years ago, I sort of bridged over into the general education world in some support through a federal center that was funded jointly by the department of elementary and secondary education and the Office of Special Education Programs to really look at teacher quality issues.

It was within that bridge; that jumping over. That it really started to give me a really good perspective of what the complexity is in terms of instructional practice when it comes the lens that you're looking through and the student populations that you're serving. And also, who is guiding the way in which you're supposed to be providing instruction. That really; that experience really helped me see from a general ED and a Special Education perspective you know what instruction does and needs to look like. And what teachers are experiencing.

I now also have the opportunity to work with two federally funded centers within the Office of Special Education Programs that helps provide supports to States to implement things that Allison set us up with. In terms of RDA and the State Systemic Improvement Plans. But, as she very well-articulated; you know we're all in this together. Because, our goal is to ultimately ensure that all students. Students with disabilities included are getting the type of instruction that is going to move the needle towards their growth.

[Slide 21 – Instructional Practice]: So, I wanted to lay out that perspective. Because, it's within that perspective that you'll understand why I have appropriately coined this section of the presentation about mixed messages and mixed opportunities depending on who is speaking to you. Allison set us up nicely and laid out some terminology in terms of evidence-based practices, research-based practices and scientifically-based. Things that I think we're all familiar with hearing. I'm going to throw out another terms and depending on your orientation, some of you may or may not have heard before and one for those is high leverage practices.

These are practices that were identified through Deborah Ball at the University of Michigan and they are really resonating in the general education world. They are nineteen practices that are really important that all teachers need to know and be able to do in order to work successfully with all students in the classroom. But, it is a new term. It may be new to some of you and maybe not to others. But what I found is that all of these terms and the variation and the interpretation of those terms is really leading to mixed messages for teachers in the classroom.

When you think about your educator career, you go through preparation; and you're prepared a certain way. And then you enter into certification and licensure where you are assessed to determine you level of knowledge and ability to teach. And that assessment is based on a certain level of expectations around instruction. Then you are potentially evaluated at the; when you are hired and you're in a position. You are evaluated in an educator evaluation system.

And there again, there is some basis and constructs within these educator evaluation models that really focus on the type of instruction that you're providing. And then ultimately and hopefully you're being provided some level of professional learning and support in your careers as you're teaching students to help you grow in your practice. And it's within all of those different subsets that there is so much potential. Whether it's mixed messages about expectations or the practice. And it becomes very challenging for teachers in classrooms.

[Slide 22 – What does it Feel Like for Teachers?]: So, what does it feel like for a teacher? And I noticed at the very beginning that we have a lot of teachers on the webinar today and hopefully this resonates with you all. Although sadly, it probably does. It is that there are a lot of mixed messages about what we should be doing with instruction. And you see the little joke here. I'm not going to read it because you see it.

But, the general idea is that teachers are getting mixed messages and they're getting caught in the middle. So depending on if you're referring to the term as high leverage practices or evidence-based practices or whatever it is. What they're not understanding or not being able to do then is to be able to provide instruction well. Because, getting mixed messages they might be supported differently and they may be evaluated differently. So, which target are we trying to meet?

And I think as Allison said, we're all trying to meet the same target. But it is that we're trying to provide the level of instruction and that helps students learn. And then figuring out how do we collect the level of evidence that we need in order to determine are my students learning in my classroom? And if they're not, what do I need to do differently? How does my instruction need to be modified or intensified in order for all of my students to achieve the target that we set out?

But right now, because we have all of these different terminologies and current levels of expectations around instruction. I feel like teachers are getting caught in the middle in terms of these varying expectations. Which leads then to the next slide.

[Slide 23 - Result]: Closing the door, burying it, locking it or doing whatever we can to just work with our kids. You know as a teacher; as a former teacher. I felt it often. Just let me work with the students. Let me do this, let me do this well. But, you have people coming in to evaluate you. You have professional development providers. You have all of these folks coming in and helping you support student learning.

But, if you're getting mixed messages it's not feeling like very much help. And this is why we; Allison and I and Rebecca and several of us have started thinking about this. In terms of how do we come to this common ground? So that we can make it clearer in terms of expectations of instructional practice that we do know works with the bulk of students. But then most importantly, how do we ensure that teachers are armed with the resources and the supports that they need?

To really be able to collect and then analyze student data? To know when a practice; whether it be an evidence-based or high leverage or whatever we want to call it. When a practice works and when it's not working and then what do we need to do differently to ensure that it works for the bulk of our students?

[Slide 24 – Tier 1 Instruction: What is the goal?]: So, what is quality Tier One instruction or core instruction? You know I think that all of us would agree most likely that we want shared ownership and accountability for all students. We are not segregating out a certain population of students. Whether they're in a co-teaching situation or a segregated situation, it doesn't really matter. We just want to make sure that we all own the progress of our students; general ed teachers, special ed teachers, etcetera, etcetera.

Also, that all students have access to the curriculum. And that they have the opportunity to

access the curriculum through instruction and assessments in a way that they can demonstrate their knowledge or lack thereof. So that way, we can figure out what do we need to do differently to ensure that there is indeed access for all students.

And again, we want instruction and practices that are effective. We have more diversity in our classrooms today than we've ever had before and it's hard. Teaching is a hard job, it is a science and it is difficult when you're got thirty students in your classroom. Trying to decide which set of instructions are going to work. And what do I do if it doesn't work for a group of students?

And that's what we're talking about here. Which instruction do we know through evidence is most likely to be most effective with the bulk of students? And if it's not, what do we need to do next? How do we intensify it to ensure that all students gain access to that curriculum?

And of course, the screening and progress monitoring is critically important too and sometimes I think we look over that. I know as a teacher, I did not look at my data near enough. And I really didn't have the skill set to understand why some of my students weren't learning. And if I didn't know why they weren't learning, I didn't know what I needed to change. And then, I didn't have the right supports to make sure that I knew how to change in order for my students to do better.

And I think that every teacher in every classroom; that's our ultimate goal. To ensure that students can learn. So, if we're getting mixed messages and we're squabbling quite frankly over the terminology we're missing an opportunity I think to really help identify the types of instructional practices that we know through evidence to work with students. But then also recognizing that it is not a done deal and it's not a guarantee. But the most important thing that we do is monitor out student's progress to then see if it is indeed working and to see what we need to do next.

[Slide 25 – Defining Evidence-Based Practice at Tier 1]: And then ultimately if necessary go to Tier Two or Tier Three which Rebecca will talk about here in a few minutes. But you know when we're looking at thirty students in a classroom, we can't; we don't want an inverted triangle where we have more students in Tier Two or Tier Three services than what really should. So, that is why core instruction is so critically important. But, it's challenging for the reasons that Allison let out before.

It's challenging in these ways. There is variation in the context, there's implementation fidelity issues and there are student characteristic issues. So when we know that we have an evidence-based or a particular practice, we know that there is probably a controlled trial. There's a study or there's something that's going on that does have concern with the level of fidelity with the implementation. And the reality of most general education classrooms is that it's very different. The contexts are different and the leadership support is different.

All of those different things makes a difference in terms of fidelity of implementation. So, it really does make it challenging at Tier One to implement and keep that level of consistency and fidelity in implementation. With that all being said, it really does lead into missed opportunities for shared ownership. As a general education teacher I worked with general ed teachers all of the time and they say well, I've never been trained to work with or support students with disabilities. I don't know how to work and support all of the diversity in my classrooms.

And because sometimes we get mixed messages about high leverage practices and evidence-based practices. We're also sort of segregating the field to some degree. To think that the practices at Tier One are teachers that are providing core instruction and they really don't know what to do. Where in fact if we could come to an agreement around what are those kind of bridge practices? Or practices at Tier One that we know more than likely through research is going to move the needle for kids.

And how do we make sure that the data is collected to know if it's working? We're going to be much further along. The end result is missed opportunities for shared ownership. We decrease the confidence as I mentioned before in teachers at core. And then we end up having more students referred to Tier Two and Tier Three.

Which really isn't really very well leveraging of the talents and the skills and expertise of your special education in the building if we are not being very purposeful about ensuring that the students are getting the type of instruction at core and all the way through that they need.

[Slide 26 – Participant Poll]: So we have a poll. We wanted to try and get to what you perceive in your perspective roles. If you're a teacher at core or if you're a special education teacher. Or whatever role that you're serving. But, what is it that you perceive as a primary challenge in implementing evidence-based Practices at core in Tier One instruction?

So you see some of those listed here. Some of which that I believe you've heard before.

[Participant Poll]: That EBPs place too much emphasis on lower order skills. Again that they don't align with expectations about core instruction. So, if you're implementing an EBP in your education evaluation model for example is not looking at that EBP as quality instruction. You've got a misalignment issue.

In some cases, EBPs might be thought to be too difficult to use in a general education classroom because you've got thirty students, a lot of curriculum and coverage that needs to happen. There isn't enough time. Of course that's always a big thing. And then the students cultural language needs are not maybe considered at a level of depth in EBPs.

So if you can take a moment to vote. And this is a check all that applies. So, it doesn't force you to pick one. But; and you may pick all. That's telling too. But if you could, click as many here as you feel are appropriate.

Sarah Arden: And Lynn while I'm watching the votes come in for the poll. We did get a couple of questions about who you referenced when you were speaking of the high leverage practices. I thought it was Deborah Ball but I wanted to check.

Allison Gandhi: That is true. Deborah Ball.

Sarah Arden: Okay and then also if there was a link? It sounded like you; there was a reference to a list of the practices. Or something.

Lynn Holdheide: There is.

Sarah Arden: And initial site. If we had access to a link so that we could get that out to everyone.

Lynn Holdheide: I would be happy to do that as soon as I turn it over to Rebecca. I will go find the link and send it to you Sarah.

Sarah Arden: Great

Lynn Holdheide: Does that sound like plan?

Sarah Arden: Okay, yeah that's great. And we're at about sixty percent voted at this point. And we're split just about evenly between evidence-based Practices don't align with expectations and then there isn't time to teach evidence-based practices and other content. Those are at about forty and forty percent each.

Lynn Holdheide: Okay

Sarah Arden: And then we have about twenty-eight percent at the evidence-based practices are too difficult to use.

Lynn Holdheide: Okay

Sarah Arden: In the general ed. So, those are our highest three in the polling.

Lynn Holdheide: Very good and very telling. Thank you Sarah and thank you all for loading in and giving your input.

[Slide 26 – Participant Poll]: That's very telling because I think sometimes when we think about EBPs in the different contexts, it could be perceived as very difficult to do. It could be perceived that outside of content. Which if done well the high leverage practices and the evidence-based practices can be integrated quite well to meet the needs of students in content.

But again, I think this is a telling point. That there is some misalignment in expectations. And the lack of understanding and agreement about what HLPs and EBPs need to be implemented in Tier One has really caused more confusion in the field. And really the result is as I said before. It is that we're kind of paralyzed because we're just not sure of the instruction that we should be doing to meet the needs of the children. I think that we are all about making sure that we are so, this is good information.

[Slide 27 – Can/should there be a happy medium or consensus in the rigor of evidence at Tier One?]: You know this comes back to what Allison was saying before. Do we need to have more flexibility around the other? And I think we're trying to make the case that there is; what's the risk of doing so? Because at this point, it feels like we're spending a lot of time defining each EBP and what level and so forth. Where it's causing a lot of confusion in the field and teachers are left really in the end result not know what to use.

We do know what works through our studies. Our studies are critically important. Our evidence is critically important because we don't have; we have a lot of expectations set out for our students to prepare them. And so, we want to do the best job that we can. That all being said;

really thinking through how you ensure that the instruction that's at Tier One is leveraging what we know about evidence. But then also, allowing some level of flexibility in ensuring that and understanding that there is a lot of variables that impact fidelity when you're thinking about core instruction.

But at the same time, what are we doing to better prepare and support our teachers to have the data? And the progress monitoring mindset? And the support within the schools to ensure that we're monitoring that these things are working?

[Slide 28 – Tier One: Dimensions of Fidelity]: And again, you know schedule, coverage content. These are things you know that all impact the fidelity of your implementation in your evidence-based practices or in your high leverage practices. That really make a big difference. In terms of how much time do you have when the instruction occurred? Or was it the correct screening administration and scoring happening? Were the EBPs followed through implementation fidelity?

All the things that we laid out before. But you know, where can we land to ensure that we do provide it in a way that general ed teachers and core instruction can happen that it can make sense? That is feels feasible. That it is more supported and that we're getting those consistent messages?

Those are the things that I feel very passionately about. Because I do see the mixed messages from the different worlds that I get the opportunity to [Indiscernible] that the teachers are feeling. And the end result is that the students are the ones that you know really miss the opportunity to learn.

[Slide 29 – Resources to Support Identification of EBPs at Tier 1]: So, we mentioned some resources. And here are some more resources here. And actually Sarah, the link to the high leverage practices that you asked me about before; that I totally kind of forgot that it was here. But, "Teaching Works."

Sarah Arden: Okay, thank you. And I just sent that out to everyone. Yeah

Lynn Holdheide: Thank you. I had it already. But anyway, these are different ones. But it's important to look at the high leverage practices through Ball. Because it is getting a lot of latitude and a lot of leverage in the general education space. And the EPS is working closely with Ball and her colleagues to develop some assessments; performance assessments around these practices.

I think it's also important to note that CEEDAR, the CEDDAR Center; which I'll talk about in a moment and describe that. Has work with the Council for Exceptional Children through a number of folks. To really take a look at those high leverage practices and articulate those in a way that makes sense for students with disabilities and special educators. So that work will be coming out I believe in the next; I'm not going to promise something here because I'm not sure. But in the next number of months.

They will be coming out. But, there has been some effort to you know work around these high leverage practices. And to demonstrate the alignment between these and the evidence-based

practices support in special education as well.

[Slide 30 – Barriers to Use of EBPs]: So I wanted to take just a minute to talk about the CEEDAR Center. Because one of the things that was noted in a number of studies and in a number of different ways. Was that the teaching and the practice of evidence-based practices weren't necessarily happening in all preparation coursework. So again, it's not a surprise then that EBPs are hard to implement. In that there is maybe a mixed understanding of what they are and how they can be implemented.

If it's not being taught in preparation courses and programs. And so OSEP had the fortitude to think about ways in which we could improve and enhance preparation programs. Both at the general ed side and the special ed side. To ensure that all teachers and leaders are really; have a good understanding of what evidence-based practices are. As well as being able to implement them through a level of fidelity.

So, the CEEDAR project is a five year project that work with State Agencies and preparation; education preparation programs in general ed and special ed. To really think through how do we improve the way in which teachers and leaders are prepared to really support students with disabilities? But in particular around the use of evidence-based practices.

[Slide 31 – Evidence Base]: We; at the onset of the CEEDAR Center we did work with a group of researchers to identify the evidence-based standards. And there is a link to the document here. And what you'll find is that they're very much aligned with the ones that Allison reference earlier. In what is in the ESSA Act that is currently out in terms of the levels of evidence. But, what we wanted to do is identify our levels of evidence as we started to create tools and resources for our states and for our preparation programs that we're working with.

To ensure that we too were looking at the same levels of evidence. And making sure that we were clear in terms of levels of expectations and practice. So, you're welcome to take a look at that. I think you will see that it very much aligns to the Council for Exceptional Children evidence-based as well.

[Slide 32 – CEEDAR Innovation Configurations]: At the onsite of CEEDAR one of the thing that we wanted to do is offer tools to preparation programs. So, if you come back to what is the primary goal of the CEEDAR Center? And the primary goal of the CEEDAR Center was to work alongside State Education Agencies and preparation programs in general ed and special ed to ensure that we are doing a better job to support teachers and leaders to support students with disabilities. That's basically what the bulk of the CEEDAR Center is all about.

But of course when you're supporting students with disabilities or teaching teachers and leaders to support students with disabilities. You have to be able to come to terms with what practices are important that teachers to know and be able to do. So, we created these things called the innovation configurations. And basically, these innovation configurations, and there are a number of them. And you can see the link here.

That really identify through meta-analysis and through the research and through all of that. What are those essential competencies that teachers need to know and be able to do to implement evidence-based practices well? So these articulate those well. And they're kind of the ground

foundation. And they're very lengthy for the most part. Because you know when you're site research it does take a little bit of time to get it all in.

But if you look back to the very back there's something called an innovation configuration. Which basically helps preparation program faculty and PD providers quite frankly. Take a look at what does the evidence; what are the essential components of the evidence-based practice? And am I teaching it most importantly? And then am I allow an opportunity for a candidate to process that skill so that they can when they are hired or in a classroom can implement it well.

[Slide 33 – CEEDAR Tools and Resources]: This is just an example of what an IC might look like. And the text is a little bit small and you might not be able to see a lot of it. But, you can go on any of the ICs and see them. But the whole intent here is that the essential competencies are listed on the left hand side. And they basically through the research are identifying what are the practices that teachers need to know and be able to do implement the evidence-base for their paced reading practices well.

And so you see there on the left hand side, phonetic awareness, phonics; things that we know through scientifically based reading research are essential for teaching reading. I think the important thing to note too across the top there is a level for evidence. And basically what that's looking at is how well are we teaching it within our course work? And then also, how well are we aligning our field experiences and opportunities to practice within our course work to ensure that we're not only teaching about it? But we are providing opportunities for candidates to practice with feedback and support in order to reach a level of fidelity.

So, it's really; it's not designed to be an evaluative tool. Although it could be; although I wouldn't suggest that. It's really designed more to take a look across all of the preparation that we are providing for our candidates; teachers and leaders, both general ed and special ed. How well are we teaching this? Because we can't expect to be evaluated on it if we never taught it to begin with.

So these tools are there. And many of our preparation states are working collaboratively to use these as a way to strengthen their programs. And sometimes, that means adding a course. Sometimes that means modifying the course content. But it really is a cross reference at the University level to so do that. If you click on the next click. It will show you; these are the next Innovation Configurations that we do have on. If you can just go back? Yeah, thank you.

That we have on that are available. So, you do see certain content areas covered. Again, if you go to the CEEDAR website they are available for free. Anybody can use them. And again, even if you're not a faculty member which these were originally designed for because of the CEEDAR role and mission. It can be very well used for professional development. So, if you have a PD provider coming in; for example to teach reading instruction. How well is their PD materials aligned to those essential components?

And then most importantly, if you're a district administrator and you are thinking about; you know my reading scores aren't looking better. Then maybe that's a part of your initiative. To improve the Reading scores of students all students including students with disabilities. And I've decided to hire somebody to come in and train my staff. So how well is that training aligning to the evidence?

And then most importantly, what am I doing as a district administrator to ensure that those teachers have an opportunity to practice those skills and gather feedback in order to improve? That is critically important. These tools can easily be used in that manner.

[Slide 34 – CEEDAR Tools and Resources]: And we didn't just want to stop there either. We didn't want to just say okay, you have a problem here. You're not teaching evidence-based practices in phonetic awareness. That's not a part of your curriculum, you haven't taught it; it's not a part of your PD.

You know, that's one thing; it's to learn that you need it. But then there's also the next course of how do I design professional development and courses that really cover the level of depth needed in the evidence-based practice? How do I do it well? And how do I ensure that there are opportunities to practice the feedback, etcetera?

So, CEEDAR has created what we call course enhancement modules. And basically, it takes it to the next step. It includes example syllabi, it has video clips from experts, and it has example activities and handouts. And then ultimately, you can download a professional learning module that basically provides you a course or a PD activity.

So, over a long period of time that provides training on what is an EBP? What's the research behind it? And then most importantly what does it look like? And how do you practice it? And how do you continue to improve in it?

So, it provides everything. You see, there are some slides here on the screen. It provides talking points. It provides handouts and materials. And like I mentioned before, it has video clips. It's pretty much everything in a pretty little package.

And it's free, it can be used. It can be modified most importantly. Because you need to add what's working for the students. And the same with teachers, you need to understand what their prior knowledge and experience is and what their needs are. So, if I were to identify that Phonetic Awareness, here's an area that our teachers are struggling with.

Then I could go into this module and pull out that piece. So, it is very customizable. And it is intended to be. But, it could be used in full. So, I just wanted to pull those out as a huge resource because they could be quite valuable if you at a district or school level and a state level that are trying to improve the level of training that teachers get so that so that you can positively influence the Reading outcomes for students.

[Slide 35 – CEEDAR Tools and Resources]: And it's important to know this too. It's a follow up to the theme that we've been talking about. That we've established these course enhancement modules based on the tiers. So, what the math; evidence-Bases math instruction looks like at Tier One? What does it look like at Tier Two? And what does it look like at Tier Three?

No, there's not scientific cutoff. As you all know. The real cutoff of is if it is working well for our students. And then knowing when you need to go and modify and intensify the services. But we did want to lay it out to some degree so that it was clear. What do you need to do at Tier One at core instruction? And then how do you know when you need to go further?

And so, these course enhancement modules are very much set up like that. And I think it lends itself very well to think through the way that we design course work as well as the way that we design PD that way.

[Slide 36 – Course Enhancement Modules]: So, this is where you can find the course enhancement modules if you go to our website. For which you've had links all the way through here. You can go in and just go into your resources tools and come down to the course enhancement modules. And you will see those listed here. These are the ones that are currently available.

And if you'll click real quickly? You'll see that we have one coming up hopefully soon on reading and we also have one on leadership. Which we haven't talked about yet. But, it's important for leaders to really understand what evidence-based practices are and what instruction should look like. But particularly if they're going to come in and evaluate how well you're doing. So again, these are free resources and they can be used and modified at will so please take a look.

[Slide 37 – Evidence for Intervention]: And that leads me to the end of core instruction. And highlighting a few resources through the CEEDAR Center. And so now I'm going to turn it over to Rebecca to talk about Tier Two and Tier Three.

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Thank you Lynn. Good afternoon everyone. My name is Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds and I am the Deputy Director of the National Center on Intensive Interventions. And thank you for allowing me to join you today to talk a bit about our next section. Which is thinking about evidence for intervention at the Tiers Two and Three levels. Sometimes I will say secondary and intensive interventions to also kind of mean Tier Two being secondary intervention and Tier Three being intensive intervention.

[Slide 38 – Tier Two: Secondary Prevention]: So the Tier Two or secondary prevention level is really intended to target specific skills with standardized packaged interventions that have evidence of efficacy. Or that have been that have been rigorously evaluated and shown to work for most students. So, these are those package programs that many of you may be familiar with. You may have many of them on your shelves at school.

And they tend to be the most efficient first stop for when you know the child has some intervention needs. They may need; for example, they may need additional help in phonemic awareness of fluency building or math facts. Or some specific area of need where a packaged program and kind of help address that particular skill deficit. Because the needs are packaged, they have a specific skill sequence and they are the best aligned to current thinking about what meets sort of that gold standard of evidence that Allison talked about earlier. So, when they're available you want the packaged programs that have strong evidence of rigor.

[Slide 39 – Resources to Support Identification of EBPs at Tier 2]: Some resources that we have. At the National Center on Intensive Intervention's website we have a tools chart that actually provides a review of these kinds of intervention programs in reading and mathematics for elementary and middle grades. And they can be very; these tools charts can be very useful because they not only provide information about the quality of the evidence. Or the quality of the study that was conducted to determine if the program was effective or not.

They also give information about the size of the impact of the effect size. So that means if the kid did better, how much better? And is it enough that I should care about that? And then also information about what it takes to implement the program. How much it costs? What kind of training is involved? The group size needed to implement the program and so forth.

Because, those are very important considerations when determining whether or not to adopt a Tier Two program in a school. But really the thinking behind these is that they have been rigorously evaluated for at risk students for which the programs have been designed. So, when you have a group of at risk students, you're most efficient step is to try something that we already know through prior testing that is likely to work for most kids.

At the same time, we know that these programs work for about eighty percent of our at risk kids. So, there are another twenty percent of kids for whom these kind of standardized packaged programs are not likely to be enough. And I'll talk more about those in a minute. But again, the goal at the Tier Two level is to use things that have been evaluated to help us be efficient in getting the most at risk kids as we can using these more efficiently designed programs. And using individualization and the data collection that goes along with the program to the intensive or Tier Three level.

[Slide 40 – Additional Resources]: So, I just noted some resources that have already been mentioned earlier in this Webinar. These are where you can look for information about Tier Two programs. Again, the tools chart that I linked to on the last slide really provides some nice examples of these kinds of packaged programs. But other services including the What Works Clearinghouse, the Best Evidence Encyclopedia, the IRIS Center, the EBI Network and the RTI Center all provide additional information on how to identify or select these kinds of Tier Two or secondary intervention programs as well. And also, about how to look at whether or not the evidence about the quality of these programs really meets the standards of rigor necessary.

But, what's useful about these resources is that they keep you, you the individual teacher or Administrator for having to go to research journals and try to make sense of result sections that may have information that is not aligned with where your training is and where you want to be spending your time. As an entity that provides technical assistance and support and interprets evidence for the field. You know our role in some of these other organizations roles is to distill that information in a way that consumable to people who don't have PhD's in statistics or research methodology. But who do need to be able to take and use that information.

And again, the goal of this is to kind of help us be more efficient in providing that information. So that the people who are being tasked with using and implementing these programs can actually be spending their time developing their skill sets in how to implement these well. And then understanding the critical components.

[Slide 41 – Participant Poll]: So, some of you may be familiar with some of these resources already. So we just interested from; for our own learning. Which resources do you already use to identify evidence-based practices or curriculum materials for your setting? And go ahead and check all that apply.

[Participant Poll]: We've got the What Works Clearinghouse, the NCII Tools Chart, and information from research journals, recommendations from professional organizations or other

resources? So go ahead and take a moment to respond to the poll please.

Sarah Arden: Rebecca, we still have some votes coming in. We're at; or we're coming up at about seventy percent of the participants have voted.

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Okay

Sarah Arden: Seventy percent are at recommendations from professional organizations.

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Um hum

Sarah Arden: But then we've got sixty percent at What Works Clearinghouse. Fifty-three percent at information from research journals and about forty-two percent at NCII Tools Charts. So, kind of high numbers there but our biggest two are recommendations from professional organizations and What Works Clearinghouse.

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Great, well I'm impressed. That's a nice range of tools that people are using. And I've very glad to hear that people are familiar with the tools charts because of all the work that we've put into those. Alright so again, I think that for those of you; many of you sound familiar with these resources. You are probably aware of some of the pros and cons of these different strategies for identifying programs.

Some of these various resources may be more or less efficient for you. For actually finding things that are likely to work for your setting. You may notice in searching for tools for different grade levels and different subject areas that there are real limitations on the number of things that meet those most rigorous evidence standards for different populations of students.

For example, when we're thinking about primary grade Reading. There are a lot of resources out there or packaged programs that have some strong evidence of effectiveness. However, when we get into middle and upper grades in mathematics or science or content area reading. There are fewer and fewer of those programs. So, sometimes we're left asking, okay well what do we do when those; there aren't programs that meet those most rigorous standards?

So I think that that's again another area where people are struggling with. How do we implement high quality practice that is rooted in evidence in the absence of something that meets those most rigorous standards?

[Slide 42 – Limitations of Gold Standard Evidence]: So, I think you skipped a couple of slides.

Speaker Four: Are we where we need to be?

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: No

Speaker Four: Sorry

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Can you go back one? Yeah, okay and then forward. Okay

[Slide 42 – Tier 2: Dimensions of Fidelity]: Alright, so with respect to the Tier Two the; and the evidence standards involved. You know part of how we know something is; meets these

rigorous standards of evidence. It is that we know the package is implemented in the way in which it was designed or that it meets certain criteria of fidelity of implementation. And again, I think the Tier Two level is the most easily and logically aligned with how the field more generally talks about both evidence and fidelity monitoring.

And this notion that if a program has six components then we implement all six components every time. Or that we deliver the instruction the way that it is designed in the user's manual. That the students do all of the activities. That if the program is intended to be delivered three days a week for thirty minutes with four kids in a group. That's how it's delivered and it's not once a week for a half an hour with a group of fifteen kids or something like that. That really would deviate from what the package was evaluated and shown to be effective.

So, it's really critical that when we think about fidelity at the Tier Two level, that we think about this notion of the schedule. The adherence to the program. And then also whether or not progress-monitoring data was collected? Because as I mentioned earlier, even the best designed evidence-based program is unlikely to be effective for all students from looking at the research literature on interventions research, we know that about twenty percent of at risk students do not respond even to well-designed intervention programs.

So, they need something different. And the way to find that out is by looking at the progress monitoring data. Furthermore, there may be circumstances for which the program is not well aligned to your population. For example, a program may have been validated on a population of students that didn't include a large number of English language learners. And you may be teaching a group of students that has a large number of English Language Learners in it.

And so you may have reason to believe that your population is not necessarily a match for the population that was studied when the program was evaluated. So, it's really important to implement your own progress monitoring data collection so that you can determine for yourself. Is this program working for my students? Okay and hand in hand with that is did I deliver the program the way that it was designed.

Okay so, if I haphazardly do the program every once in a while and my kids aren't making progress. I can't blame the program right? But, if I've implemented the program with fidelity and I've made sure that is the case. And I'm taking data and I'm seeing low levels of progress. That gives me more information about whether or not the program is an issue.

Now one thing to think about however is that if you're working with a group of five students and four of them are progressing and one is not. That may be indicative of a child who needs a more intensive intervention. Versus a situation where in taking data that group of five kids has five of the kids not making progress. That may be an indication that there is something with the program or the fidelity of implementation that needs to be looked at.

So again, the fidelity piece is really important when we think about determining whether or not something is having the impact that we want it to for our students.

[Slide 43 – Limitations of Gold Standard Evidence]: So, as I mentioned earlier. You know when we can get the highest level or gold standard of rigorous evidence of effectiveness for an intervention program. You know we should use that information and if that; if a program has

been rigorously evaluated and shown to have a large positive impact. By all means, this is the kind of program that we want and that we should look for. However, working in the real world we know that there are limitations of what it means to have this gold standard evidence.

As I mentioned earlier about generalizability to other populations. Again, you may have a program that has been evaluated with a population of students who speak English only. And you're population of kids may be kids who don't speak English or are learning English. There may be questions about whether or not a particular intervention will translate to your population the way that you would hope it would.

Also, rigorously evaluated randomized control studies take many, many years to complete. They often cost million; a million if not several million dollars. The replications involved can be very time consuming and expensive. And so because of that. There is often a significant time delay between when a program is initially developed and studied. And when it may be released to the public for more general consumption.

And that time delay may mean that there are windows of time in certain; again in certain subject areas and grade levels. Where they're really very few if not no clearly package resources that are good. Or that we can point to and say yes, we know this works. And so in the absence of that, we also need to think about how can the data that we're collecting in our context help us to determine if that intervention is useful for our students? And how can we think; how can we look for the best available evidence when this gold standard isn't there?

And then as I mentioned earlier. When we think about kids with intensive needs. This notion of the generally effective intervention is not a universally effective intervention. There are children who will need more. And as I said earlier, it's about twenty percent of kids who have been identified as At Risk who will need a more intensive intervention. No matter how well designed and rigorously evaluated the study is.

[Slide 44 – Tier 3: Intensive Intervention]: So this is what brings us to Tier Three or the most intensive level of intervention. And at the most intensive level, we move away from standardized programs that we saw at Tier Two and we move into individualized interventions. Where we are embedding instructional supports and strategies based on the progress monitoring data that we're collecting on the child. This allows us to target how we are intervening with the student and integrate both academic and behavioral supports.

And what's critical to this level of intervention and perhaps even more than at the Tier Two level. It is the frequent use of our progress monitoring to determine the impact. Because, this is what's giving us the evidence that what we're doing for this child is having the impact that we want it to.

[Slide 45 – Data-Based Individualization]: So within the National Center on Intensive Intervention, our approach to this is data-based individualization. And this is our graphic that depicts the DBI process. And what you'll see is at the top we start with a validated intervention program. That's the Tier Two. Okay, so we've used that for Tier Two and we've determined that there are twenty percent of the kids that need something more.

So, we're going to intensify that Tier Two. But, we're not going to intensify it by just making a wild guess about what the child needs. Instead, we're going to collect progress monitoring data.

If the child is responsive then great, they stay in that Tier Two. But if they are not responsive, then we collect some more informal diagnostic data.

We conduct error analysis, we do progress monitoring, and we may do functional assessment of behavior if there is a social behavior issue that we're concerned about. And we use that information to create a hypothesis about what needs to be changed in the Tier Two program to make it more intense and more individualized to meet the needs of the student. Based on that hypothesis, we adapt the intervention and we monitor progress.

And again if we're having the impact that we want we continue to do what we're doing. But, we also continue to collect those data so that we know that either the child is progressing and the program is having the impact that we want. We are collecting our evidence, that the program is effective for the student. And if it's not, then we're not continuing to do it. Instead, we're going back to the diagnostic data collection, creating a new hypothesis and further adapting the intervention.

[Slide 46 – What is evidence?]: So often times we get asked, so what's the evidence here? Because, I've been told to do this package intervention with fidelity and then I deviate from the program by adapting it. That's not fidelity any more, I'm not allowed to do that. Well, we're here to tell you that number one if the data is showing that the program implemented with fidelity isn't working then it's not an evidence-based practice for that student. Okay so you; and we know that when we validate these programs there are kids for which this is not going to be sufficient.

But there is about four decades of intervention research that shows the DBI process. When kids are a part of that process where you're combining assessments and interventions and using them in a dynamic way to intensify the program. That you will actually increase learning outcomes for kids with intensive learning needs. But, what's also important is that when you're collecting the data and the context of that process. That you're using assessment tools that have evidence in validity and reliability.

So, that means that they have been designed for the purpose that they are being used for. That they are designed for progress monitoring and comparing performance over time.

[Slide 47 – Resources to Support Identification of EBPs at Tier 3]: So, at the Tier Three level; again we have multiple resources intended to help support identification of evidence-based practices and strategies at Tier Three. First, we have those academic and behavior intervention programs. And you'll look through the packaged Tier Two programs on some of these lists. But then you'll also see in the behavior list some information about the evidence behind more non-branded strategies that may be used and embedded into a child's intervention program.

We're also working on beginning to add those to the Academic Tools Charts. So that there will be not only packaged programs but information on the research around different kinds of academic intervention strategies. Furthermore we know that progress monitoring and the use of the data is a critical piece of the DBI process as an evidence-based practice. And so, we also provide reviews of progress monitoring tools in academics and behavior. To help you identify tools that are valid and reliable for this purpose.

[Slide 48 – Additional Resources]: Additional resources on intensive intervention. We have a series of materials on the National Center on Intensive Intervention website. Including multiple Webinars, entire training series. We have some sample lessons and behavior support materials that may be downloaded and used for free. We have Ask the Expert videos with national; which include responses from nationally recognized experts in the field among a number of other resources on the website.

The Center on Instruction. Which is no longer funded but has a very nice website. It also has a great document that they've developed on designing an intervention for student with intensive reading and mathematics needs. And so that's another report that is worth the read if you have the chance.

[Slide 49 – Tier 3: Dimensions of Fidelity] So at the Tier Three level, fidelity starts to look a little bit different. Because we're adapting the program to meet the needs of an individual student, we're no longer worried necessarily about adherence to a packaged program in the same way that were in the Tier Two level. So instead, we're asking ourselves did we do what we said that we would do. When we created the plan for this child, did we follow through?

If we said that we were going to move the intervention schedule to; instead of three days a week for twenty minutes. He's now getting four days a week for forty-five minutes. Did we do it? Did we follow the schedule that we laid out? And then again, did we adhere to the individualized plan that we set for the student? So, if the program was delivered; if the program was written as a part of the IEP, then did we follow the IEP the way that we said we did?

If we said that we were going to implement certain intensification strategies, did we follow through? For example, we said that we were going to implement a behavior contract as part of math intervention time. Did we implement that contract? And did we do it enough times that the student had the chance to learn what was expected and understand what that behavior contract meant in the context of his day? If we said that we were going to build in five more minutes of fact practice every day where we give feedback to the student on their performance. Did we do it?

If we said that we were going to move our progress monitoring data collection from one a month to twice a week. Did we do it? So, those kinds of monitoring on our own execution of the student's plan. And then finally within the context of intensive intervention; progress monitoring is a critical component. So again, were we following the correct administration and scoring procedures for the use of whatever tool it is that we have selected?

[Slide 50 – Resources for Monitoring Fidelity of the Intensive Intervention System.]: Because this is kind of different way of thinking about fidelity. At the NCII, we have developed some resources for monitoring fidelity of implementation. First we have the DBI implementation rubric. And the idea here is to look at how well are we doing as a system at supporting implementation of intensive intervention?

So, this goes through and looks at fidelity of implementation at the school and district level. And then also, that kinds of progress monitoring tools that are adopted. The way that interventions are planned and designed and scheduled. Who is delivering the intervention and so forth? So, it's kind of big picture thinking about implementation of this intensive intervention. And then the

next slide.

[Slide 51 – Resources for Monitoring Student-Level Fidelity]: Shows those resources for monitoring that student-level fidelity that I mentioned. And these are also available on the NCII website and free for download. And again, this is a place where you can go in and look at; ask yourself questions about did I execute on the plan that I laid out for an individual child? So again, getting at that student level fidelity of implementation of the intervention.

[Slide 52 – Challenges]: So, to wrap up. Although it would be nice to say that you know, we can kind of fit Tiers Two and Three in these nice boxes. Where Tier Two is solely about standardized intervention and Tier Three is really about individualized intervention. There are continual; there do continue to be some challenges. And I think some things that we; both we in the research world and people working; those of us working in the practice world and kind of trying to plan the two.

Really do need to think about it as this field moves forward. So at the Tier Two level again as I've mentioned. We really want the standardized program that has evidence of effectiveness for at risk kids. But a limitation that we have is that there just not those programs available across ages and grades. So we also need to be able to think more broadly about how can we collect high quality; how can we use the high quality evidence that is available to make the best decision with what we have right now?

And again similarly, thinking about validity across contexts or across different groups of students. What are the kinds of things that if they've been show to work with one population of students are likely to be transportable to other populations? And what are things that we may need to evaluate in other context? At the Tier Two level also as mentioned earlier, sometimes there a perceived lack of alignment with; to Tier One or even to Tier Three. So again, building on that understanding of what it is that we're trying to develop skill wise at the Tier Two level and how that may be able to support kids ability to access what's going on at the Tier One or on a program level.

And then the questions around feasibility of implementation. So what do we do when the Tier Two program that is shown to work and is supposed to be delivered for three hours a day in groups of two kids? How many public schools can actually do that? So, how can we be also creating more intervention programs that are; that allow us to use our resources in an efficient way so that we can meet as many kids as possible?

And then finally, what do we do with low-incidence populations of kids? For whom there may not be enough students to evaluate an intervention in the kind of most rigorous way. Where we're using a group experimental design? So, how do we do rigorous evidence in data collection; evidence. I'm sorry, how do we develop a body of evidence for those populations? In terms of identifying those kinds of packaged interventions and programs?

Similarly at the Tier Three level, part of why we do this adaptation in data collection for; at the Tier Three level. Is again, there are typically not programs out there that are pre-packaged that address the complexity of challenges that kids with intensive and sever and persistent learning needs present with. Very often, children at this level are having co-occurring behavior and academic problems. There may be other kinds of cognitive issues that need to be addressed.

Like just working memory or attention that a lot of packaged Tier Two intervention programs on their own may not address.

So that's where the need to build this individualization comes in. But we could also use more research into how to build those kinds of programs more effectively. Similarly, practitioners are often not trained to deliver and these kinds of programs or build these kinds of programs on their own. And so, this is something that is an ongoing need both in terms of teacher's professional development and pre-service teacher training.

We also find that progress monitoring tools while they're widely available at certain grade levels; for example elementary reading. There are fewer choices as we move into older students as we look at reading and mathematics. There are materials available but, they do tend to be more limited in scope. And then, this perception of what it means to provide off-level instruction and assessment. There is sometimes a belief that if I'm providing instruction and skills I'm not teaching to the grade level standards.

And I think what's important here too is to kind of work as a team and as a system to help people better understand the learning progressions. And why, if a student is struggling with fractions that a Tier Three program may be addressing things like fluency with division and multiplication facts. Or working with understanding fraction magnitude when the Tier One may be working on much more complicated fractions concepts. And so kind of understanding that learning progression and why at Tier Three there may need to be really addressing things that are underlying the grade level standards that they want the child to eventually reach.

So, the next slide.

[Slide 53 – Questions]: We would like at this point to turn it over to the audience for questions. And we realize that there isn't an ability for people to ask questions verbally. But the question box I believe has been active. And I will turn it back over to Sarah to see if there are any questions that have come in.

Sarah Arden: Sure, yep. We have a couple that we have indicated to the participants that we would talk about at the end. The first couple of questions came up right at the very beginning when we were talking about ESSA and the different kind of research. We had three or four questions come in about single-case design. Where do single-case designs come in? I think Allison there may have been a couple of bullets on that.

Allison Gandhi: Yep

Sarah Arden: In your presentation. So if you could maybe expand a little bit on that? We had some folks ask about single-case design and the research around single-case design.

Allison Gandhi: Sure, so actually in ESSA as far as I know and I actually did a quick search during the Webinar Sarah. There's not language in ESSA about where single-subject design falls. However, I would say that you know typically especially when you look at the What Works Clearinghouse guidelines. Single-subject design is generally considered among the highest in terms of rigor, for a certain type of intervention. So, interventions that are designed to be sort of one on one for an individual students.

Because, you really can't study those with a randomized trial. But you can with a single-subject design. It's kind of a different way doing an experimental study on those kinds of interventions. So, I would say probably that that would be aligned in the strong category with ESSA. But the other thing that I would just say about single-subject design and I think it's kind of interesting.

You know, although teachers aren't you know doing this kind of rigorous research. The general theory behind single-subject design is very much aligned with what teachers do in Tier Three. I mean, they're essentially gathering data on their students before providing an intervention. They then provide the intervention, they gather more data and make a change based on that data. They gather more data and then keep making changes. You know so everything is based on data.

So, sort of in that way it kind of aligns to what we've been talking about. The kind of evidence that is important at Tier Three which is really what the teacher is doing and the data that they're collecting. That in itself is the evidence that can support the practice that you're doing for your particular child that you're working with at Tier Three.

Sarah Arden: Thank you. We also had a couple of other questions about strategies for schools? Like title schools or schools where there are a lot of issues like English language learners, or poverty or trauma. And then we end up seeing a lot of students in Tier Two or Tier Three. If anyone had any strategies or resources or ideas to help educators to really kind of sure up Tier One or to kind of increase the quality of the Tier One instruction especially at Title schools?

Rebecca Zumeta Edmonds: Well, I think this is where some of the Tier Two programs; or things that may have historically been thought of as Tier Two programs. But that are packaged to address the particular learning needs can be very useful. Some of them are actually designed for class wide implementation. So, they could be used for teaching at a larger group level.

It may also be important to think in those buildings about prioritizing where time is spent on particular high priority areas of learning. And by that I don't mean cut out recess. But, I do mean if you; when you think about the things that need to be accomplished in a day. If reading is the most important in the day are we making sure that that time is protected? And that kids are getting the one hundred and twenty minutes a day that's being prescribed.

Are we doing; are we making sure that we're delivering all components that are recommended by the National Reading Panel? Are we using a core program that has evidence for being effective for kids? With the kind of learning needs that they are presenting with and so forth? Often times. Curriculum materials are not rigorously evaluated as a package.

But sometimes they are and you can also look at whether the components of the program do meet standards of evidence or rigor? And or that are aligned with the recommendations from a reputable professional organization. So, those are some of the things that I would recommend doing at the beginning.

In addition to taking data and making sure that you're got good screening information on students. And that you're monitoring their progress.

Allison Gandhi: And I think just to follow up with Rebecca. I think that's where the intersection between high leverage practices and the evidence-based practices relative to content come into

play. So if you think about direct explicit instruction and modeling, quality feedback and all of these things that we know are critically important. But, let's then intersect then between how we're providing reading instruction. And because it's as Rebecca said, it is where you're prioritizing your efforts and your time but it's also about the quality of instruction.

So, how are you ensuring that you're teaching those scientifically-based reading components in leveraging those high leverage practices that are evidence-based in terms of you know the feedback? Be it direct explicit instruction, opportunities to model or scaffolding. All of those that we know as good teaching; how do you have that intersection between the evidence-based practice? And I think that's where at Tier One we can do a much better job generally in making those connections for teachers. So that the time that we do have is leveraged to the best degree that we can.

Sarah Arden: Excellent, thank you. I think we have about three or four minutes left. We have tackled, those are the bulk of the questions besides that link to the resources document that Lynn was talking about. That we sent out earlier. Those were all of the questions that we to address that we would talk about as a whole group.

It looks like there are still a couple coming in. And it looks like those are getting answered by just about everyone. So, since we have about three minutes left. I'll just go ahead and wrap up. I would like to thank our presenters and panelists for sharing that information.

And thank you for your participation and for some of the great questions that you asked. I just want to give you a couple of reminders. This Webinar is being recorded and it will be posted.

[Slide 54 – References]: We sent the link out a couple of times to you individually and generally to those of you that have asked. So, if you need access to the webinar that will be posted. We just did get a comment that; I'm sorry, I'm reading and also trying to talk at the same time. It says that one thing that would help many general education teachers in all schools but maybe in Title One schools is to think about combining what Rebecca just said about assistance on how to help structure small group instruction while monitoring a whole class.

So, sometimes the small group instruction and those sorts of things are hard to do at the same time. So, teachers sometimes have difficulty running small groups. Like PALS, [Indiscernible] and peer tutoring. So, those are some things that can be talked about and thought about shared on our Chat Board from one of the participants. And so, that could be another.

Lynn Holdheide: Sarah

Sarah Arden: Component.

Lynn Holdheide: Sarah, I just; well I think that's a really, really good idea and I think we can follow up on that. But again, just before we close out I wanted to reference again that all three of us represent a number of different nationally funded Centers that are; that have a lot of these resources for free. And you know can provide some level of guidance depending on what level around what we talked about today. So, I just wanted to also reference the fact that you go a National Center on Intensive Intervention, National Center for Systemic Improvement and the CEEDAR Center that are all national Centers to really support this kind of work.

Sarah Arden: Excellent, that's helpful Lynn. And again, thank you all and we're right about at our time. So, it looks like we've addressed some of your questions. If you have a question that we didn't answer, we will be posting a Q and A with answers to your specific questions or most of the questions that we received during the Webinar. So, that will be posted along with the Webinar slides.

[Slide 55 – Disclaimer]: And the recording. So, be on the lookout for that.

[Slide 56 – American Institutes for Research]: And with that, I thank you again for your participation. And thank you to our panelists. I will go ahead and wrap up the day. I hope you have a really nice afternoon and thanks again for your participation.

[End of Transcript]