



## Monitoring Fidelity in RTI – Webinar Transcript October 20, 2009

---

*Amy:* Good afternoon! My name is Amy Elledge and I am pleased to welcome you to the webinar “Monitoring Fidelity in Response to Intervention.” This webinar is presented on behalf of the National Center on Response to Intervention. The National Center on Response to Intervention is a technical assistance and dissemination center funded by the Office of Special Education Programs. The Center's mission is to build the capacity of State Education Agencies (SEAs) to assist Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in implementing proven and promising frameworks for RTI. We are pleased you could join us today.

We are fortunate to have Dr. Daryl Mellard, a co-principal investigator for the National Center on Response to Intervention, with us today.

Dr. Mellard also serves as the Director of the Division of Adult Studies for the Center for Research on Learning at the University of Kansas. Previously, he was the Co-PI with the OSEP-funded National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (NRCLD). Dr. Mellard co-authored *A Practitioner’s Guide to Implementing Response to Intervention*. His other research activities focus on adolescent and adult literacy and the transition of students from adult education into postsecondary settings. We are very fortunate Dr. Mellard is sharing his expertise with us today.

And now I will turn the presentation over to Dr. Mellard.

### **Slide 1: Fidelity of Implementation within an RTI Framework**

---

*Daryl:* Amy, thank you. I am glad to be here. I also want to acknowledge my colleagues from the university here that appear on the title slide—Christy, Melinda and Sara—and also mention Chris Hulleman, who’s now at James Madison University and who consulted with us on multiple occasions regarding this topic of fidelity of implementation and making it work within the school.

### **Slide 2: RTI Center Partners**

---

*Daryl:* We also have partners through the American Institutes for Research—you heard from Amy. The other staff at AIR and Vanderbilt are important as we frame these concepts and implementation of RTI, including the work around fidelity.

### **Poll 2: What position best describes your participation?**

---

*Daryl:* We would like to begin with an opportunity to get a sense of who’s in the audience today. What position describes your participation?

### **Poll 3: Do you represent –**

---

*Daryl:* Also the notion of who you represent—



**Poll 1: Are you a member of an RTI development or implementation team and, if so, at what level?**

---

*Daryl:* It looks like I skipped over this first poll question about members of a development or implementation team and at what level.

The polls are closed. That's good. Thank you. We have broad representation on the general education side and the special education side as well. That's a good group.

**Slide 3: Outcomes for the Day**

---

*Daryl:* As we look through the rest of our agenda, what I would like to do is break this up to first cover your familiarity and background knowledge, next cover the development of fidelity of implementation within your state education agency or district and then think about that implementation within the school. We do this in the context that while most of our Center's work is focused on state education agencies, we know that most of the states with whom we are working are developing sites that can serve as models or exemplars of their RTI implementation. It's important that as the state education agency staff work with those local districts, they have this information about fidelity of implementation. It's in that context that we're offering the presentation today.

**Slide 4: What is Fidelity?**

---

*Daryl:* Briefly, what is this construct about fidelity? If we want to reduce that to a basic construct, the two words to associate with it would be consistency and accuracy. Are we using our curriculum and instructional practices consistently (e.g., across time, throughout the day, across lessons)? Are we using them accurately, as they were intended to be used? When we think about RTI—for the secondary level of prevention—many use a standard treatment protocol. Those protocols were developed in a specific validation study with a level of training, a qualification of those delivering that instruction, a specified amount of time for those learners, and an expected type of response from those learners. We need to be sure those protocols are used consistently and accurately with the intent and with the validation that was part of their development. Otherwise, if we aren't consistent and accurate, how do we explain the student's lack of response? It may be that the lack of response is due to student characteristics, but may be also, and very importantly, due to how the instruction was implemented. Dean Fixsen makes a great point that the first standard for delivering high-quality instruction is having available high-quality instructional practices, high quality curriculum. If we have them available, that doesn't necessarily satisfy the positive student outcome. We have to be sure that they are implemented as intended as well.

**Slide 5: The Real Goal = All Students Improve**

---

*Daryl:* When we have available, and implement as intended, those instructional practices, we would expect students to improve. Of course, the goal would be for all students to improve when they are matched to the appropriate curriculum and instruction.

**Slide 6: RTI Principles and Practices**

---



*Daryl:* We are going to expand the concept around fidelity today so we don't just speak about curriculum and instruction. This framework on the slide illustrates that fidelity should run through all of these elements that are important to our implementation of RTI. Some of you are familiar with the book or the movie *A River Runs Through It*. Fidelity should run through those components about our leadership, about our assessment programs—curriculum and instruction are obvious—about the consistency and accuracy of our data-based decision-making. Then the steps we are using to fully integrate RTI within our school programs, as well as the activities that will lead to sustaining the RTI framework in our schools and within our district and aggregating to the state agency, [provide a] framework that has broad application.

---

**Slide 7: Positive student outcomes are dependent upon –**

*Daryl:* We can imagine that student outcomes are dependent upon the fidelity of implementation of our scientifically research-based practices, the degree to which those implemented interventions have that validation—that evidence, the research support for their effectiveness. Then the implementation at the teacher level, that is, in the classroom, also is high. We can look at the quality of our implementation at multiple levels

---

**Slide 8: RTI: Surface vs. Deep Views**

*Daryl:* We know that much about RTI will be challenging to schools. We have evidence from our work with elementary schools and middle schools that folks have, if you will, some of those components in place, and may confuse the fact they have progress monitoring with a full-blown RTI framework. “But we're doing that” is a rejoinder we hear. When we look more carefully, we see that they have some of those procedures in place, but for full implementation of RTI as well as an orientation towards the fidelity running through our procedures and practices, we need to go deeper. Sometimes that's talked about as a second order change where we understand that persons' behaviors, beliefs, attitudes, roles, and responsibilities are going to need to change with a full implementation. We know that this may be more dramatic for some than [for] others.

---

**Slide 9: Surface or Deep? P (Success) = ?**

*Daryl:* This example is from one of our site visits at a middle school. We received this response in the focus group with teachers. The question to you would be, “Does this sound like a school that has gone through the surface change or the deep change, where folks really have come to be on the same page about their RTI framework? In this instance, what do you think the probability of success would be for the particular school? Again, we recognize that much of what we ask school staffs to do around fidelity of implementation will require changes in roles and responsibilities, and time for everyone to come to grips with that, to come to appreciate the complexity of what's involved with implementation, as we will demonstrate.

---

**Slide 10: Setting the Stage**

*Daryl:* To increase the chances of success, we need to set the stage. You wouldn't go fishing without checking your fishing tackle, making sure you have the right bait, checking the weather, and checking the lake conditions. Well, if we are serious about making RTI work, we also need to set the stage within our state, school district, and school. We have to have the right climate to make sure we have buy-in from the multiple stakeholders that are involved with implementation. And we want evidence of more participation than just talk. That is, we might get the verbal,



almost acquiescent response, “Oh, we’re doing it, we’re involved,” but to make this work, everyone’s roles and responsibilities need to be defined because RTI is complex, and adding something unique about fidelity of implementation can also be challenging.

Back a few years, when we were looking at RTI implementation in elementary schools, across those 40 schools, we found very limited evidence of fidelity in the instruction being assessed or fidelity in the curriculum implementation being assessed. Part of that is a limitation on the instruments that are available. We also know that more and more those instruments are becoming available to help school staff, their RTI implementation teams, or within a professional learning opportunity, an opportunity to implement or access fidelity. This strong leadership linked with the support systems means that we need everyone leading—if you will, bringing their talents to this task of assessing fidelity, and also understanding again that, if the goal is about improved learner outcomes, we all have to be there to support it.

The third bullet speaks to the importance of the active ingredients around RTI. Some of those active ingredients include conducting screening and using the screening results to make decisions about students’ progress; conducting monitoring on a regularly scheduled basis, and recognizing that the focus of that progress monitoring can vary with the intensity of the instruction; and knowing we have to have clearly differentiated tiers—differentiated in a manner so that the instruction becomes more intense, if necessary, as learners progress. This is important about setting the stage, not only for RTI, but also for fidelity of implementation. We have to assure that the leadership and the staff understand what’s expected, what to do, and have clear communications.

### **Slide 11: Creating the Culture**

---

*Daryl:* Creating the culture is an important understanding to develop those roles and responsibilities that are going to shift to make RTI frameworks successful within the school. The well-integrated fidelity system gives us a check to ensure that the process is being implemented, to make sure that we are obtaining the results we intended. When it comes to establishing this foundation, having clear expectations of who is conducting what set of activities and when, and how well it’s working becomes very important. I need to add that some folks might look at the fidelity checks as an attempt by school administrators, or really anyone, to be punitive...to punish staff who aren't implementing procedures as intended. If that's the climate within the school, we doubt that RTI has much of an opportunity of being successful. RTI has enough different principles and concepts that it's very important for the staff to come together to have a shared understanding of what's involved. That climate has to be supportive, so being supportive is helping one another understand what is expected, helping one another do what is expected, and having the communication so that those expectations, rules, or procedures about implementation can be completed.

### **Slide 12: What Does Fidelity Look Like at the Whole School Level?**

---

*Daryl:* So what does it look like at a school level? In that, we need to have an assessment system that works in a manner to inform us about students' risk status—possibilities of having reading or other achievement-related difficulties. We need an assessment system that informs about students' progress within grade level or curriculum standards. We need to have a curriculum that



is evidence-based, have an understanding how the curricular elements link across tiers and across grade levels, and be sure that our instructional practices are evidence-based. The nice part about these curricular and instructional elements is the accumulating amount of evidence that gives us a framework of what works. We know much better these days about how to organize and deliver that instruction so that generally our students will find it effective. Again, moving through the list, the staff have a clear sense of what they need to follow in terms of decision-making rules. We know when the fidelity checks are going to be completed and that they are routinely applied, not just put on paper, but that the information is used to improve instruction, improve the curricular choices that are made. We would expect these practices to be integrated so that the framework we are putting in place can be sustained. We know that we face many challenges about sustaining effective practices, not the least of which, of course, is the change in personnel; a building-level administrator changing, changes in instructional staff—all can undermine an effective system. If we have agreed-upon vocabulary, agreed-upon procedures and practices, that certainly supports our implementation at the school level as well.

### **Slide 13: Five Elements of Fidelity**

---

*Daryl:* When we look in the research literature about fidelity, we identify these five elements: adherence, exposure, quality of delivery, program differentiation, and student responsiveness. These are important elements of the pie. The gestalt truly requires these five elements to be practiced within the RTI framework. In the subsequent slides, we will review these five elements.

### **Break for Questions**

---

*Daryl:* It might be a good chance to take a couple minutes and look at some questions that have come in. One of the questions that was asked earlier was about dual discrepancy: “If a school is using a dual discrepancy model, what do you recommend for a non-responder and more than one standard deviation from the class performance? Honestly, I am not sure what the person intended with that question, but follow-up and elaborate as to whether you’re asking, “What do we change?” or “How do we recognize non-responders?” It seems to be a couple of elements.

There was another earlier question, “Is there a protocol around RTI for identifying students with disabilities?” A specific protocol, no, but we do have evidence or guidelines to help with those distinctions or what we are looking for in an RTI framework, if we are going to use it as an assessment component. That's available in an earlier presentation that should be archived at our website as well.

There was also a question, “Please discuss and provide examples of local education agencies that have successfully engaged their bargaining units in the planning process to get past issues of in-class observation.” This issue arises when LEA contracts specify that only certain persons in administrative roles have the right to observe. Well, I don't recall a specific LEA as an example, but in conversations with schools, we can think of several strategies that would be applicable. One would be being sure that we have appropriate staff involved. Maybe that's a good way to approach it, through the professional learning community. Again, we take it out of the context of personnel evaluation and say, “How do we improve the quality of our instruction, the quality of our staff, for better outcomes?” A professional learning community could have the development



of fidelity measures or the fidelity assessment process as a focus. Then when we begin thinking about who might be engaged in those activities, we might include literacy coaches or we might look at other instructors at the same grade level or content level. If we're looking at fidelity of implementation around reading, who are our reading instructors? Probably a fundamental or a most important point about this is that whoever is conducting that fidelity check knows what high-quality practice looks like—someone who knows what the curriculum looks like, what curriculum being delivered with high fidelity should be. It doesn't make any sense, for example, to have an instructional aide or paraprofessional engaged in those activities if they don't know what the criterion is, if they don't know what the best practice might look like.

There was another question around, “What do I do? I am in a small school and we don't have literacy coaches. Who should do that fidelity check?” Even within a small school we can have the professional learning community designate staff there or within the grade level who would be appropriate for conducting those fidelity checks.

Here's a question from Melissa, “Turn-key training seems to be how districts cut costs. Does fidelity go down with this type of training and do you recommend it?” I will plead ignorant. I don't know what turn-key training might be about, what that is. But we know that we need folks experienced in the curriculum and instruction as well as our measures of fidelity to make that a valuable contribution.

Brett asks, “What is the best way to document interventions at a school level to be shared by administrators, counselors, and personnel, keeping in mind confidentiality?” Confidentiality is going to be important, and we would hope that they are members of the team looking at student data. Documenting interventions at the school level...if we are thinking about students at a secondary or tertiary tier, those students would have documentation about the intervention plan that's going to be delivered to them as well as documentation of their progress within those interventions.

Lisa asks, “Please share examples of how the dimensions of fidelity can be assessed reliably, efficiently, and effectively.” Lisa, we are going to give you examples of that as well as have materials posted to the website of what would serve as examples for those five elements. That's to come momentarily.

Meg asks, “Will you elaborate on the five elements?” Yes, we will! I should be getting back to that right away.

Laura asked, “What does [a] fidelity check look like and how often should it occur?” Great questions! You anticipated the webinar to come. These are the five elements, and as we review these in more detail, we will give you examples for their assessment.

#### **Slide 14: Adherence**

---

*Daryl:* First up will be a review about adherence. As I walk through the elements, I hope to give you a definition of what that is as well as some examples that one might use. We have other examples later in the presentation. Adherence answers the question, “How well do you stick to



the plan? How well do you adhere to the curriculum that is intended?” Curriculum might be about standards, might also be about the particular materials being delivered. I know there's some distinction about what constitutes curriculum. Certainly, if we implement curriculum with a set of materials, we would expect to see adherence to the set of materials being used to teach that curriculum. “How well do I stay true to that intervention and avoid the drift that can come in some implementation examples?” We know there will be some drift—that's to be expected—but adherence reminds us that an intervention, a curriculum, a set of materials were developed and tested with a specific purpose in mind. So the example would be, at the primary level, following the progress monitoring level procedures, adhering to that set of procedures that are in place for completing progress monitoring, and then making sure all the pieces of the interventions have been implemented as intended. That's true across any of our levels of prevention as well.

### **Slide 15: Duration/Exposure**

---

*Daryl:* The second element is about the duration and exposure. Now the focus is very much on the student's participation, and we ask, “How often does a student receive an intervention? How much time?” The focus becomes less on content being delivered, which, remember, was about adherence. Adherence focused on the content being delivered, the procedures being completed whereas duration says, “Did I deliver the intervention in a strong enough dose to have the desired effect?” We can think of that in terms of learning opportunities. We can think of it as the number of days in a week or minutes per day that would be involved with the delivery of that curriculum.

### **Slide 16: Quality of Delivery**

---

*Daryl:* When it comes to quality, not only do we need to follow the rules, or expectations, of the particular content and be sure that the duration and exposure are of sufficient fidelity but we also need to look at the quality with which the intervenor, the instructional staff person, delivers that curriculum. I like the notion of, “Was the teacher, instructor's enthusiasm evident? Was the instructor engaged in delivering the content?” For example, when I think of today's presentation with you, I can imagine that the next time the quality probably will be at least higher. I'll have this example under my belt in delivering this kind of content. An example to look at regarding the quality of delivery is the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. These standards refer to time for feedback and student questions, how the teacher manages the classroom (what that looks like) and the opportunities and structure provided for student learning. Those would be the elements of the quality of delivery.

### **Slide 17: Program Differentiation**

---

*Daryl:* The fourth element is program differentiation. Program differentiation is sometimes confused with adherence. Let's see if we can make this a little more distinct. In both instances, we are talking about content. Adherence is about the curricular choice, the materials that we're using, and program differentiation is also about the delivery of that content. In this case, we are concerned about contamination or pollution, if you will. I'm trying to find a good metaphor for this, but imagine that in your school you had a long history of using a particular basal reading series...maybe it was Houghton Mifflin. Then you adopted a new curriculum. One would expect that the new curriculum would be implemented. It's what we would expect to see teachers using. But if a teacher was kind of fond of some of those old materials from the previous curriculum and happened to have a set of those available sitting over there on the shelf in the classroom,



perhaps those old materials would get pulled into the reading lesson. If that's true, then we contaminated or polluted the new reading intervention because we are no longer adhering to established procedures for the new curriculum as we would expect. We reduced the differentiation of those curricula. So fidelity would be in question again.

### **Slide 18: Student Responsiveness**

---

*Daryl:* The last point is about student responsiveness. My favorite example: let's count the number of heads in the middle school or junior high school, student heads on their desk. That would probably be one quick index of student responsiveness. Are the students engaged? These are critical examples. We can have high adherence, great exposure, an enthusiastic teacher doing a great job delivering, and we may have clear program differentiation. But if it doesn't match, doesn't fit the students so that they are engaged, it's all for naught. Again, the outcome focuses on student responsiveness. The R in RTI is about student responsiveness. This represents that fifth element, that critical element. Can you get by with looking at only three or four of those? Which ones would you choose? It just doesn't seem to us that you can take any of these for granted when it comes to implementation.

### **Slide 19: What have we learned so far?**

---

*Daryl:* So where have we been? We talked about the background knowledge and about the development – what RTI might look like at the school level and at the classroom level.

### **Slide 20: Tools to Assess Fidelity**

---

*Daryl:* Your earlier questions were about tools to help us with the assessment of fidelity. If we are working toward implementation around RTI, here are some examples of tools that we might use. You will notice that many of these assessments are completed through observation, observation of what's happening within the classroom. We might also use self-report checklists, that is, an instructor might self-report whether he or she implemented the components of the curriculum as intended. Generally, we don't see the quality of self report as high as when we have the third-party observer or when we look at student performance. That is, if part of the evidence of fidelity is looking at the skills that students might demonstrate, we need to have that as a framework using student responses as some of that evidence of adherence or exposure to the particular instructional strategy or instructional practices. If we teach students, for example, a reading comprehension strategy and they are able to repeat to us the steps that are part of that reading comprehension strategy, well, we have one index of fidelity, a framework. If they can repeat those and they don't add their own steps, well, we would say there's probably high adherence to the instruction as well.

### **Slide 21: Applying Fidelity Elements within your RTI Framework**

---

*Daryl:* This ties back to one of the questions that was submitted. How can we look at our elements around RTI implementation and assess them for fidelity? Again, we're wanting to move beyond a classroom perspective of fidelity to recognize that this is part of the consideration at a school level and at a school district level. Let's go to the far right. We have student engagement. We can say, "Were the students engaged in our assessment?" That might be one index. We look at the curriculum, the materials that are being offered. Again, do we have evidence of student engagement? With regard to instruction, the instructional practices that



would occur within the classroom, do we have evidence of student engagement? We believe that we've got appropriate check marks with these elements we want to examine around RTI implementation. You may see it somewhat differently, but in general, we should be able to look at adherence across the leadership practices, across the assessment practices, across curriculum, instruction, and data-based decision-making, and what we're doing for integration and sustainability. We should have evidence to speak to the adherence and exposure elements around fidelity. I think you can work through this type of framework within your school district, within your schools, and make decisions about the appropriate tools, what would be the appropriate framework, if you will, for assessing fidelity across these multiple elements. So this is kind of your "to-do" task, and then we'll send Melinda, Sara, and Christy to your school to check up on you and see what a fine job you have done.

### **Slide 22: Sample Fidelity Protocol**

---

*Daryl:* Here's a sample protocol, again, that a school might want to consider. In the left hand column, we have indicators. These are indicators of when I might want to conduct a fidelity check – a situation that occurs that says, "It's probably wise for us to consider the fidelity with which this practice is occurring." Looking at the new curriculum, a new intervention, we would say, "What are the tools that we might use for fidelity?" Here we listed both the coaching and the direct observation with a checklist, the frequency with which they should be completed, and the important elements about the feedback and follow-up. Let's imagine we have a new school administrator within the school. Well, that certainly sounds like an opportunity for some of the fidelity that had been established to drop away. But if we use some of the student data, school data, observation of what's happening within the classroom, the use of a principal "walkthrough" (actually, rather than just walking through, this is a short sit down and observe procedure) we can, again, get an understanding of what high fidelity might look like. On the left-hand side are situations, opportunities when we think assessing fidelity would become important.

### **Slide 23: Other Factors Related to Fidelity**

---

*Daryl:* Here are other factors that are related to fidelity both in a positive and a negative way. We think about the organizational characteristics of the school, and again, that's about the climate, the morale within the school – the willingness to, and appreciation of, delivering high quality instruction so that all of our students will benefit. We know that some program characteristics can be more complex than others. We know that beginning teachers have a different set of experiences than those instructors who've been on the job for fifteen or twenty years. Both present unique challenges when facing innovations. But professional development, continued, focused professional development, is a foundation for making all of that work –and certainly the information that you gain from a fidelity check can support that.

### **Slide 24: The Power of Coaching**

---

*Daryl:* Maybe you are familiar with this set of data, from Joyce and Showers, about the power of coaching. On the left-hand side, you see a number of training components related to professional development. If we use theory and discussion plus demonstration in training...plus practice and feedback, and then we add this other element, coaching, you can see the power of coaching. The cells within the table illustrate the level of implementation that one might get as we add more intensity, if you will, to the quality of our professional development. What becomes clear is this:



if we truly want use in the classroom, if that's the goal, then there's a great benefit to ensuring a coaching component. This may not mean additional, different staff. This may be a change in roles or responsibilities of the staff who are engaged.

### **Slide 25: Flowchart**

---

*Daryl:* Here we have three elements. We want you to think about how your professional development might work using this framework to improve fidelity. We have a professional development day, and in it, the coach models what the new practice might look like and hopefully we would have opportunities for the teacher to practice that. After the teacher practices, we use the fidelity information to provide feedback, and as a consequence of the feedback, we have a couple of options. One is more modeling by the coach and teacher practice, or we might say, "Let's look in the classroom then. We completed our professional day, so let's see how it transfers to the classroom." Again, you may have an example where the coach models within the classroom and the teacher implements. After teacher implementation, we have our fidelity check, and feedback. The other option: you may go from the professional development day to the teacher implementation. This gives you another opportunity in which the teacher implements and we have someone completing the fidelity check and providing feedback. Again, you have three options: the teacher could return to implementation again, maybe we want to have more classroom modeling, or maybe we want to go back for additional professional development. Particularly, I'm sure you would be pleased for an opportunity for professional development at the University of Kansas, especially during basketball season. Maybe that's an option for you as well, and I would be glad to work with you on that.

### **Slide 26: Practices to Ensure Fidelity of Implementation**

---

*Daryl:* Practices to ensure fidelity. Be sure that the components, procedures, and techniques are well-described. We need these as a rubric, if you will. We need to have expectations spelled out for folks so that the roles and responsibilities for staff are clearly delineated; tools are in place and flow well within the day-to-day operations of the school; and we want to make this link between the fidelity data and outcome data. The research literature is pretty clear. Anytime we have higher fidelity of implementation we have better results. That applies whether we're looking at the chemistry lab, the hospital setting, the doctor's office, or when you take your car to the mechanic. If the rules are followed, if we follow those procedures, we're going to have higher fidelity, and better outcomes as well. The story I was told yesterday was that in the future, we will have two persons in the workplace, a man or a woman, and a dog. And the man or woman are there to feed the dog, and the dog is there to make sure the man or woman doesn't mess up the equipment. Maybe we're not quite there yet. As team players, we are all going to have an important role in this implementation.

### **Slide 27: The Cycle of Benefits**

---

*Daryl:* We can link benefits from that high fidelity. With programs that have higher credibility, we can demonstrate to legislators, our school boards, and our parents that our programs are working and we get positive outcomes. This should improve the staff's motivation and their sense of efficacy. They should feel more accomplished, if you will.

### **Slide 28: Reflection**

---



*Daryl:* When you think about these materials, consider what you already have in place with regard to those five elements; see what can help you with that implementation. Then ask, “What do we need to get higher fidelity?” Probably that includes a closer link of our practices with the measures we’re going to be using as well as with the professional development opportunities. Again, early on, there were a few slides about building climate within the school, having appropriate climate. Those are critical. Again, that’s fundamental to make this work.

---

**Slide 29: Tools to get you started**

*Daryl:* In one of your questions, you asked about tools that would be available to you. We will be sending these as examples for you to have available. Again, they serve as examples; we don’t believe they are necessarily all at the quality that one would want. In fact, as you move to implementation, you are going to see that you need to do some tailoring of the tools, specifically for your setting as well. These examples will be sent along to the RTI Center’s website and will be available to you as well.

---

**Slide 30: What’s Been Covered?**

*Daryl:* Now we hope that, if I muddled through this well enough or had enough fidelity to the presentation, your background knowledge around fidelity has been enhanced and you have a sense of how to develop a system to assess fidelity. Again, check to see that the district has a role, the school has a role, and the classroom has a role in ensuring fidelity. Then, you can make this part of your plans for that implementation.

---

**Slide 31: THANK YOU!**

*Daryl:* Here is additional contact information for Melinda and Sara, who were instrumental in putting these materials together.

---

**Slide 32: References**

*Daryl:* If you wanted further reading, this is a list of those sources about fidelity of implementation that we cited. I would particularly draw your attention to the Dane and Schneider reference – it’s just a good overview, and the Carol O’Donnell article – it’s just very instructive in getting a broader appreciation for these constructs around RTI as we move ahead. Thank you so much!

---

**Break for Questions**

*Daryl:* We should take a look at some of the other questions that have come in. Terry asks, “Please elaborate on each of the tiers.” The primary level of prevention (if you’re meaning primary, secondary, tertiary) has to do with the core curriculum, that is, where we would expect 80% of our students to be successful. Secondary would be the secondary tier of prevention, the targeted instruction where we might be serving 15% of our students. The tertiary level of prevention is for those students needing the most intensive interventions. If we compared that to our hospital, that’s the ICU, where we have the most specialized level of instruction, the highest frequency of progress monitoring, the most individualized direction for intervention.



Amber asked about “tools to assess fidelity.” The examples will be available to you from our website.

---

*Amy:* I just wanted to say that we are nearing the end of our time. I wanted to thank you on behalf of the National Center on Response to Intervention for sharing your presentation today, and let the participants know that the responses to all questions submitted will be emailed out to webinar participants and will also be posted on the National Center on Response to Intervention’s website. The slides will also be available on the National Center on Response to Intervention’s website.

If you have additional questions about monitoring fidelity in RTI please email them to us at [rtiwebinars@air.org](mailto:rtiwebinars@air.org).

I would like to invite you to join us for our next webinar that will be on November 18, 2009, at 2:00pm Eastern time. Dr. Russell Gersten, executive director of Instructional Research Group and professor emeritus in the College of Education at the University of Oregon, will discuss RTI and Mathematics. During this webinar, Dr. Gersten will summarize the research related to RTI and mathematics, and share implementation examples from the elementary and middle levels.

We would appreciate your feedback about today’s session. Please take a few minutes to complete the webinar evaluation that you see on the screen. We value your feedback, and ultimately your suggestions will assist us in making decisions for our future webinars.

Once again, thank you for participating today!