

# CPSE 620 - Academic Intrv RTI

Spring 2017

Section 001: 160 MCKB on T Th from 4:00 pm - 6:30 pm

## Instructor/TA Info

### Instructor Information

**Name:** Gordon Gibb

**Office Location:** 340G MCKB

**Office Phone:** 801-422-4915

**Email:** gordon\_gibb@byu.edu

## Course Information

### Description

This course prepares learners to work collaboratively within a school-wide multi-tiered system of supports to assess individual student academic needs, to use data to plan instruction, to monitor student progress and make changes as needed, and to solve problems when Tier 1 school or classroom interventions are not successful.

### Materials

### Learning Outcomes

#### Learning Outcomes/Course Objectives

1. Explain the role of professional learning communities for implementing RTI as learned in CPSE 615.
2. Explain the problem-solving approach learned in CPSE 615.
3. Describe RTI for meeting individual academic needs, specifically distinguishing between the roles of RTI and special education.
4. Create and present a proposal to a school faculty for establishing MTSS to address reading difficulties.

5. Demonstrate assessment for academic needs for making instructional decisions within the RTI model.
6. Demonstrate the use of assessment data to make instructional decisions with in the RTI model.
7. Describe major theories of learning and motivation.
8. Demonstrate how to identify and select scientifically-based instructional interventions based on common usage and on investigations in research literature.
9. Demonstrate how to monitor student progress and make data-based decisions within the RTI model for moving students within and between tiers, and for referral to special education.
10. Demonstrate strategies for troubleshooting the RTI system when a plan is not successful for a student or for the school.

### Grading Scale

Grades	Percent
A	95%
A-	91%
B+	88%
B	84%
B-	81%
C+	78%
C	74%
C-	71%
D+	68%
D	64%
D-	61%
E	0%

### Grading Policy

All assignments are due on the date listed. I will award up to 50% credit for assignments submitted one class period after the due date. No credit for submissions two or more class periods late.

### Attendance Policy

I expect you to attend every class session unless formally excused prior to the class. Please email on or before the class date for emergencies.

## Course Expectations

**Computers** You are encouraged to use a digital device or laptop computer in class. Most of the course documents can be accessed online and saved to your device for use in class, and we will occasionally access the internet. You may choose to print and bring hard copies if you like. Please **do not** distract yourself or others by accessing websites other than those required for class.

**Assignment format** You are to type all assignments unless otherwise directed by the instructor. I prefer that you use Word and submit via Learning Suite online submission. If Learning Suite is being cranky you may submit via email to [gordon\\_gibb@byu.edu](mailto:gordon_gibb@byu.edu)

**Cell phones** . . . are to be used only for class work.

**Professionalism** You are completing a graduate program as an education professional. Therefore, your classroom deportment is important. A professional is consistently prepared, on time, prompt with assignments, and refrains from distracting peers or the instructor by talking out of turn or engaging in unnecessary casual conversation during class.

## The Mission of Brigham Young University Special Education

We maximize the potential of learners with individualized educational needs to elevate their quality of life. We accomplish this by supporting the mission and aims of a BYU education as we integrate teaching, research, and service. We specifically:

- Prepare competent and moral educators who select, implement, and evaluate research-based effective teaching practices and appropriate curriculum for learners with special needs.
- Prepare master special educators who provide leadership in problem solving and collaborative relationships with professionals and families.
- Add to the knowledge base of special education and related disciplines through research.
- Serve and advocate for learners with individualized educational needs and others who support them.

## Course Objectives

See learning outcomes.

## Bibliography

Buffam, A., Mattos, M., & Weber, C. (2012). *Simplifying response to intervention: Four essential guiding principles*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Burn, M. K., Scholin, S. E., Kosciolk, S. & Livingston, J. (2010). Reliability of decision-making frameworks for response to intervention for reading. *Journal of Psychological Assessment, 28*(2), 104-114.

Bursick, B., & Blanks, B. (2010). Evidence-based early reading practices within a response to intervention system. *Psychology in the Schools, 47*(5), 421-431.

Ciullo, S., SoRelle, D., Kim, S. A., Seo, Y. J., & Bryant, B. R. (2011). Monitoring student response to mathematics intervention: Using data to inform Tier 3 intervention. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 47*(2), 120-124.

Connor, C. M., Alberto, P. A., Compton, D. L., & O'Conner, R. E. (2014). *Improving reading outcomes for students with or at risk for reading disabilities: A synthesis of the contributions from the Institute of Education Sciences Research Centers*. Washington, DC: National Center for Special Education Research. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544759.pdf>

Datchuk, S. M., & Kubina, R. M. (2013). A review of teaching sentence-level writing skills to students with writing difficulties and learning disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education, 34*(3), 180-192.

Denler, H., Wolters, C., & Benson, M. (2009). Social cognitive theory. [Online] [http://project542.weebly.com/uploads/1/7/1/0/17108470/social\\_cognitive\\_theory\\_education.com.pdf](http://project542.weebly.com/uploads/1/7/1/0/17108470/social_cognitive_theory_education.com.pdf)

Dulaney, 2013. A middle school's response to intervention journey: Building systematic processes of facilitation, collaboration, and implementation. *NASSP Bulletin, 97*(1), 53-77.

Erickson et al., 2012. The school implementation scale: Measuring implementation in response to intervention models. *Learning Disabilities—A Contemporary Journal, 10*(2), 33-52.

Gresham & Little. (2012). RtI in math class. *Teaching Children Mathematics, 19*(1), 20-29.

Hughes & Dexter, 2011. Response to Intervention: A research-based summary. *Theory Into Practice, 50*(1), 4-11.

- Huitt, W. (2011). Motivation to learn. An overview. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. [Online] Retrieved from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/motivation/motivate.html>
- Johnson et al., 2013. Self-regulated strategy development as a Tier 2 writing intervention. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 48(4), 218-222.
- Lembke, E. S., Hampton, D., Beyers, S. J. (2012). Response to intervention in mathematics: Critical elements. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(3), 257-272.
- McEldoon, K, Cho, S. J., Rittle-Johnson, B. (2012). *Measuring intervention effectiveness: The benefits of an item response theory approach*. [Online] Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535500.pdf>
- Palinscar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 345-375.
- Sulkowski, M. L., Wingfield, R. J., Jones, D., & Coulter, W. A. (2011). Response to intervention and interdisciplinary collaboration: Joining hands to support children's healthy development. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 27(2), 118-133.
- Vanderheyden, A. (2011). Technical adequacy of response to intervention decisions. *Exceptional Children*, 77(3), 335-350.
- Vaughn, et al., 2012. Effects of intensive reading intervention for 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students with persistently inadequate response to intervention. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 45(6), 515-25.
- Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S. (2010). Tier 3 interventions for students with significant reading problems. *Theory Into Practice*, 49(4), 305-314.
- What Works Clearinghouse. Find what works! Available at <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>
- Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M. K., Scholin, S. E., & Parker, D. C. (2010). Instructionally valid assessment within RTI. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 42(4), 54-61.

### **Conceptual Framework for this Course**

Moral endeavor at Brigham Young University is established upon principles of eternal and unchanging truth contained in the restored gospel of Jesus Christ. Prophets of God proclaim that "all human beings—male and female—are created in the image of God. Each is a beloved spirit son or daughter of heavenly parents, and, as such, each has a divine nature and destiny."<sup>1</sup>

Teaching is a moral endeavor that recognizes and responds to the divine destiny of each student. Moral teachers ensure that students master the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to realize their divine potential for growth and achievement. Therefore, teachers:

1. Recognize and cultivate the individual worth of each student
2. Embrace and apply proven instructional practice
3. Establish and maintain positive, supportive learning environments
4. Value and enact respectful interpersonal behavior and responsible citizenship

Four assumptions guide our work:

1. All children can learn.
2. Schools exist to advance student learning.
3. Teachers are accountable for student achievement.
4. Accountability is monitored by data.

1. *The Family: A Proclamation to the World*. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Intellectual Reserve, 1997.

## Assignments

### Assignment Descriptions

#### Outcome 1: Role of PLCs in RTI

Due: Tuesday, May 02 at 6:30 pm

Submit a 2-3 paragraph description of the role of Professional Learning Communities in implementing Response to Intervention in the schools.

#### Outcome 2: Problem solving in Rtl

Due: Thursday, May 04 at 6:30 pm

Explain the problem-solving approach learned in CPSE 615 and how it relates to making Rtl decisions.

#### Outcome 3: Rtl and Special Education

Due: Thursday, May 11 at 6:30 pm

What is the role of RTI as a filter for special education?

#### **Outcome 4a. School MTSS plan**

Due: Tuesday, May 16 at 6:30 pm

You will work with peers in a PLC format to create a plan that will convince the Pleasant Meadow faculty to implement MTSS to address reading concerns in the school.

#### **Outcome 4b. School MTSS faculty presentation**

Due: Thursday, May 18 at 6:30 pm

Your PLC will present your proposal to the rest of us acting as the school faculty and answer any questions we ask.

#### **Outcomes 5 & 6: Assessment decisions for Rtl**

Due: Tuesday, May 23 at 6:30 pm

Demonstrate assessment for academic needs within the RTI model.

Demonstrate the use of assessment data to make instructional decisions within the RTI model.

Write to explain assessment decisions related the case studies presented in class.

#### **Outcome 7: Theories of learning and motivation**

Due: Thursday, May 25 at 6:30 pm

Describe major theories of learning and motivation and their applications to Rtl.

#### **Outcome 8: Select academic interventions**

Due: Thursday, Jun 01 at 6:30 pm

Demonstrate how to identify and select scientifically-based instructional interventions based on common usage and on investigations in research literature.

#### **Outcome 9: Moving between tiers in Rtl**

Due: Tuesday, Jun 06 at 6:30 pm

Demonstrate how to monitor student progress and make data-based decisions within the RTI model for moving students within and between tiers, and for referral to special education.

### **Outcome 10: Troubleshooting Rtl**

Due: Tuesday, Jun 13 at 6:30 pm

Explain strategies for troubleshooting the RTI system when a plan is not successful for a student or for the school.

### **Final Exam**

Due: Thursday, Jun 22 at 6:50 pm

Complete the closed book individual final exam in class.

### **Point Breakdown**

Categories	Percent of Grade
Written assignment	15%
Presentation and paper	62.5%
Demonstration	10%
Exam	12.5%

## **University Policies**

### **Honor Code**

In keeping with the principles of the BYU Honor Code, students are expected to be honest in all of their academic work. Academic honesty means, most fundamentally, that any work you present as your own must in fact be your own work and not that of another. Violations of this principle may result in a failing grade in the course and additional disciplinary action by the university. Students are also expected to adhere to the Dress and Grooming Standards. Adherence demonstrates respect for yourself and others and ensures an effective learning and working environment. It is the university's expectation, and every instructor's expectation in class, that each student will abide by all Honor Code standards.



Please call the Honor Code Office at 422-2847 if you have questions about those standards.

### **Preventing Sexual Misconduct**

As required by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the university prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in its education programs or activities. Title IX also prohibits sexual harassment-including sexual violence-committed by or against students, university employees, and visitors to campus. As outlined in university policy, sexual harassment, dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking are considered forms of "Sexual Misconduct" prohibited by the university.

University policy requires any university employee in a teaching, managerial, or supervisory role to report incidents of sexual misconduct that come to their attention through various forms including face-to-face conversation, a written class assignment or paper, class discussion, email, text, or social media post. If you encounter Sexual Misconduct, please contact the Title IX Coordinator at [t9coordinator@byu.edu](mailto:t9coordinator@byu.edu) or 801-422-2130 or Ethics Point at <https://titleix.byu.edu/report> or 1-888-238-1062 (24-hours). Additional information about Title IX and resources available to you can be found at <http://titleix.byu.edu>.

### **Student Disability**

Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere that reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the University Accessibility Center (UAC), 2170 WSC or 422-2767. Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified, documented disabilities. The UAC can also assess students for learning, attention, and emotional concerns. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the UAC. If you need assistance or if you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures by contacting the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895, D-285 ASB.

## Schedule

Date	Topics	Readings
T May 02 Tuesday	Introduction and overview Learning Outcome 1: Role of PLCs in Rtl	Buffam, Chapters 2 & 3
Th May 04 Thursday	Learning Outcome 2: Problem solving in Rtl	Buffam, Chapter 5
T May 09 Tuesday	Rtl and Special Education	Buffam, pp. 179-180, 198  Ciullo et al. (2011) <a href="http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1053451211414188">http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1053451211414188</a>  Vanderheyden, Witt, & Gilbertson (2007). <a href="http://www.joewitt.org/VanDerHeyden%20Witt%20Gilbertson%20year%20Evaluation%20of%20STEEP%20RTI.pdf">http://www.joewitt.org/VanDerHeyden%20Witt%20Gilbertson%20year%20Evaluation%20of%20STEEP%20RTI.pdf</a>
Th May 11 Thursday	Learning Outcome 3: Rtl and Special Education	Buffam, pp. 179-180, 198  Vanderheyden, Witt, & Gilbertson (2007).
T May 16 Tuesday	Learning Outcome 4: Rtl and families	Readings as searched and shared in class.
Th May 18 Thursday	Assessment decisions for Rtl	Buffum, Chapter 5  Hughes & Dexter (2011) <a href="http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00405841.2011.53">http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00405841.2011.53</a>

T May 23 Tuesday	Learning Outcomes 5 & 6: Assessment decisions for Rtl	Buffam, Chapter 5
Th May 25 Thursday	Learning Outcome 7: Theories of learning and motivation	Denler, H., Wolters, C., & Benson, M. (2009). Social cognitive theory. [Online] <a href="http://project542.weebly.com/uploads/1/7/1/0/17108470/social_cognitive_theory__ec">http://project542.weebly.com/uploads/1/7/1/0/17108470/social_cognitive_theory__ec</a>  Palinscar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. <i>Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences</i> , 49, 345-375.  Huitt, W. (2011). Motivation to learn. An overview. <i>Educational Psychology Review</i> . [Online] Retrieved from <a href="http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/motivation/motivate.h">http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/motivation/motivate.h</a>
M May 29 Monday	<b>Memorial Day</b>	
T May 30 Tuesday	Select academic interventions	Bursick, B., & Blanks, B. (2010). Evidence-based early reading program response to intervention system. <i>Psychology in the Schools</i> , 47(1), 1-10.  Vaughn, et al., 2012. Effects of intensive reading intervention for 8 <sup>th</sup> -grade students with reading disabilities: Response to intervention. <i>Journal of Learning Disabilities</i> , 45(6), 515-25.  Connor, C. M., Alberto, P. A., Compton, D. L., & O'Conner, R. E. (2014). <i>Improving reading outcomes for students with or at risk for reading disabilities: A synthesis of the contributions from the Institute of Education Sciences Research Centers</i> . Washington, DC: National Center for Special Education Research. <a href="http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544759.pdf">http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544759.pdf</a>  Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S. (2010). Tier 3 interventions for students with significant reading disabilities. <i>Journal of Learning Disabilities</i> , 43(4), 305-314.  Datchuk, S. M., & Kubina, R. M. (2013). A review of teaching sentence-level writing skills to students with learning difficulties and learning disabilities. <i>Remedial and Special Education</i> , 34(3), 180-192.  Johnson et al., 2013. Self-regulated strategy development as a Tier 2 writing intervention for students with learning disabilities. <i>Journal of Learning Disabilities</i> , 46(4), 218-222.

Gresham & Little. (2012). Rtl in math class. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 19(1), 20-

Lembke, E. S., Hampton, D., Beyers, S. J. (2012). Response to intervention in mathematics. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(3), 257-272.

Th Jun 01  
Thursday  
Learning  
Outcome 8:  
Select academic  
interventions

T Jun 06  
Tuesday  
Learning  
Outcome 9:  
Moving  
between tiers in  
Rtl

Burn, M. K., Scholin, S. E., Kosciolk, S. & Livingston, J. (2010). Reliability of decision-making response to intervention for reading. *Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 28(2), 104

Vanderheyden, A. (2011). Technical adequacy of response to intervention. *Exceptional Children*, 77(3), 335-350.

Th Jun 08  
Thursday  
Troubleshooting  
Rtl

Dulaney, 2013. A middle school's response to intervention journey: The systematic processes of facilitation, collaboration, and implementation. *Bulletin*, 97(1), 53-77.

McEldoon, K, Cho, S. J., Rittle-Johnson, B. (2012). *Measuring intervention: The benefits of an item response theory approach*. [Online] Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535500.pdf>

Sulkowski, M. L., Wingfield, R. J., Jones, D., & Coulter, W. A. (2011). Response to intervention and interdisciplinary collaboration: Joining hands to promote healthy development. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 27(1), 1-12.

T Jun 13  
Tuesday  
Learning  
Outcome 10:  
Troubleshooting  
Rtl

Th Jun 15  
Thursday  
Leadership in  
Rtl

T Jun 20      Spring Exam  
Tuesday      Preparation  
                 (06/20/2017 -  
                 06/20/2017)

W Jun 21      First Day of  
Wednesday   Spring Final  
                 Exams  
                 (06/21/2017 -  
                 06/22/2017)

Th Jun 22      Final Exam:  
Thursday      160 MCKB  
                 5:00pm -  
                 6:50pm

Final Exam