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Introduction

• The Response to Intervention Study focused on the effectiveness of various research-based strategies that are used in Response to Intervention (RtI) Tier 2 and Tier 3 classes, to help RtI teachers measure the effectiveness, or ineffectiveness, of the programs being used.
Response to Intervention (RtI)

• Kentucky, along with almost all other states, has adopted Response to Intervention (RtI) within the last five years. RtI is intended to assist low-level learners increase reading and math abilities, through use of tier groups: Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3.
Response to Intervention (RtI)

• All tier teachers are required to teach research-based curriculum for 30-minutes per day.

• Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are required to take a computer-based assessment that monitors growth, every two weeks.
Response to Intervention (RtI)

- This study will focus on how effective RtI is proving to be for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, in grades 3 though 6, in my elementary school.
- My study will also focus on what is being done for students that need intervention but cannot receive assistance due to RtI group size limitations.
- This study will analyze how Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are progressing academically.
Research Question

• How effective are various research-based Response to Intervention strategies for low-level learners?

• What can be done to move students into a higher tier more efficiently, so other students can receive services as well?
Methodology

• This study used methods to help teachers who teach Tier 2 and Tier 3 RtI groups ensure that the programs they are using are effective for low-level learners.

• This study will provide an answer to the questions-How effective is RtI for low-level learners? What can be done to move students into a higher tier more efficiently, so other students can receive services as well?
Data Tools

• Interviews with Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers
• Direct observation using a skills table organizer
• Results from the internet-based assessment, Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR), which were recorded onto a group growth chart
• Teacher reflection
Action Plan

• The action plan began at the end of March.
• The collected data compares student success from August to December, and from January to March.
• The implementation of RtI strategies was over a four-week period. These strategies were implemented for 30-minutes each day.
Setting and Participants

• Lost River Elementary
• Locations include two regular classrooms, a trailer that is used as a classroom, and a back portion of the library that is used for RtI groups.
• Teacher participants range from three years teaching experience to retired teachers.
Procedures

- Interviews
- Direct Observations
- Analyze scores
- Teacher Reflections
Evaluation

- Data collected includes Scaled Score (SS), Percentile Rank (PR), Instructional Reading Level (IRL), and Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE).
- Interviews were with four interventionists who teach only RtI classes, and two were with classroom teachers.
Evaluation

• Instruction for Tier 2 is dependent upon what is being taught in the regular classroom. Interventionists are to provide further assistance on what is being taught in the classroom.

• Instruction for Tier 3 is dependent on their Instructional Planning report from STAR.
Evaluation

• Teacher reflections had teachers list one program they teach during RtI and say why they thought it was effective or ineffective.

• All teachers indicated that the program they use seems to be effective. Their reasoning was that most students in their groups are showing growth on the STAR assessment and on assessments giving during group time.
Evaluation

• Observations of teachers during the study provided insight on the specific programs being taught in Tier 2 and Tier 3 RtI groups.

• These observations allowed for comparisons of different programs, and insight which programs seemed to be the most beneficial to students.
Reading Growth Chart

Figure 2

Reading Intervention Growth Chart
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Figure 2 shows that all groups grew overall in reading. The December column of
# Math Growth Chart

**Figure 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Tier</th>
<th>Scaled Score (SS) (Dec.)</th>
<th>SS Growth (March)</th>
<th>Percentile Rank (PR) (Dec.)</th>
<th>PR Growth (March)</th>
<th>Normal Curve Equiv. (NCE) (Dec.)</th>
<th>NCE Growth (March)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>+131</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>+12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>+70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>+3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>+95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>+88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher E/F</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>+86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>+6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• This study provides important information about specific programs and their effectiveness for low-level learners. Based on the various measurement tools, the programs being used for instruction in Tier 2 and Tier 3 RtI classroom are effective and are being used properly.
Conclusion

• This study allowed intervention teachers to reflect on their instruction and proves that the programs they are using are effective for students.
• Teachers were able to teach these programs and improve not only test scores, but scores in the regular education classroom as well.
Conclusion

• Response to Intervention has been in effect in my school since the year I began teaching. It has changed and been improved over the years and seems to be more effective each year. I intended to find that the research-based strategies used would be effective for students, which is precisely what I found.
Conclusion

• Students are responding to the strategies being taught and test scores are reflecting that. If students are not progressing, the appropriate steps are being taken by the intervention teacher, and the classroom teacher.
Conclusion

• This study is important because it provided teachers with the awareness of what they are teaching and how it impacts student learning. This study is encouraging to these educators. It is proof that their hard work is worth every second because their students are learning.
Limitations

- Limitations of this study include the amount of time to conduct research and only being able to work with teachers. More time would have allowed the researcher to observe more than one day, which would have allowed more data to measure. This would have also allowed for more time in each classroom.