**Parent Involvement**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. All parents are provided a description of the school’s essential components of MTSS and what it means for them and their child.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Communication with families exists in a language or mode that is meaningful to them.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents are notified about their child’s performance on school-wide assessments.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. There is meaningful communication between families and staff about all students’ strengths and needs, and additional collaboration when concerns are identified.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents are notified when their child begins a supplemental (tier 2 or 3) intervention.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents are provided with a description of assurances of what general education problem solving will provide (e.g., intervention plan, timelines, data to be collected, decision making rules).
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parent participation in the problem solving process is solicited.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents are provided with materials and training in the provision of curricular supports in the home setting when appropriate.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents of children who receive intensive intervention are provided reports on their child’s interventions, goals, and progress toward their goals.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Parents are informed of their right to request a special education evaluation.
 |  |  |  |  |

**School Leadership, Climate, and Infrastructure**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. All educators have attended an overview presentation of the MTSS framework that included information on implications for curriculum & instruction, assessment practices, and school-wide organization and problem solving.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The principal and school leadership team are actively committed to a multi-year implementation of the MTSS framework.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The principal shares a description of the school’s essential components of MTSS and data-based decision-making and keeps staff regularly informed of any changes.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All educators understand that MTSS is a building-wide framework designed to benefit ALL students, not solely or primarily related to special education.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Building and/or district leadership demonstrate active commitment to and support of the MTSS framework.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Educators feel shared responsibility and play meaningful roles in ongoing activities to sustain the MTSS framework.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Research-based practices are understood and accepted by educators.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Research-based practices are consistently incorporated within classroom instruction
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Professional development is institutionalized and structured so that all teachers continuously examine, reflect upon, and improve instructional practice, decision-making, and delivery of instruction.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Resources are adequately allocated to support MTSS implementation.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Schoolwide schedules are aligned to support delivery of multiple levels of high quality instruction based on student’s needs.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Adequate additional time is built in for interventions.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Shared responsibility for all children is evident among educators.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Expectations for academic performance and positive behavior have been agreed upon and shared with all stakeholders.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Educators believe that communication with families and community is an integral part of their jobs.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff can articulate information and factors that they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically relevant instructional practices, assessments, and intervention programs.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The school conducts regular evaluation of its progress toward achieving high levels of success for all students.
 |  |  |  |  |

**Curriculum and Instruction**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Universal Level | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. All core curriculum materials are research based for the target population of learners (including subgroups).
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. There are clear, high quality core curricula in academic and social behavior areas implemented with well-defined scope and sequence plans across grades.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff can articulate information and factors they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically relevant core instructional practices and assessments
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The teaching and learning objectives are well articulated from one grade to another and within grade levels so that students have similar experiences regardless of teacher.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teachers are well trained to implement core curricula.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Curricula and instruction are differentiated based on student needs.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Ongoing work to align the core curricula with state standards is evident.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Universal screening results are linked to ongoing discussions about high quality core curriculum for academics and social behavior.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The district has a plan for systematically evaluating the fidelity of core curriculum implementation on a regular basis, and addressing deficiencies.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of core instruction for both all and subgroups of students is conducted on a regular basis based on data from multiple measures.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teachers are knowledgeable about and implement principles of effective instruction, (i.e., high rates of engagement, opportunities to respond, immediate error corrections, etc.)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teachers are knowledgeable about and implement research-based principles for effective instruction in basic skill areas (reading, writing, math).
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teachers understand how to embed basic skills instruction within content area classes, and do this regularly.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The school provides enrichment opportunities for students exceeding benchmarks at all grade levels.
 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strategic Level | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. The school has standardized evidence-based strategic intervention curricula, instruction, and/or strategies identified and available across grade levels and content areas.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff can articulate information and factors they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically relevant strategic intervention practices and assessments
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Strategic intervention is well aligned with core instruction and incorporates foundational skills that support the learning objectives of core instruction.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. School schedules allow for maximum use of time for supplemental strategic interventions.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Strategic interventions supplement core instruction.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data-based criteria and procedures for moving between tiers of intervention are set.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Instructional staff members are trained in interventions to be used.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Group size and dosage are optimal for the age and needs of students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Strategic evidence-based interventions are delivered as intended with integrity.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of supplemental, tiered instruction for individuals and sub-groups of students is conducted on a regular basis (i.e., at least 3 times a year)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. By combining high quality core instruction with intensive tiered supports, the school has a plan to accelerate learning for all at risk students so they meet grade level standards in 1-2 years.
 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intensive Level | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. The school has standardized, evidence-based intensive intervention curricula, instruction, and/or strategies identified for intensive intervention.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Staff can articulate information and factors they consider when adopting culturally and linguistically relevant intensive intervention practices and assessments
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. School schedules allow for maximum use of time for intensive interventions.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The intervention is individualized.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Decisions regarding student participation in both core instruction and intensive intervention are made on a case-by-case basis, according to students need.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intensive interventions address the general education curriculum in an appropriate manner for students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data-based criteria and procedures for moving between tiers of intervention are set.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Instructional staff members are trained in intensive interventions to be used.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intensive evidence-based interventions are delivered as intended with integrity.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of intensive, tiered instruction is conducted on a regular basis.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. By combining high quality core instruction with intensive tiered supports, the school has a plan to accelerate learning for all at risk students so they meet grade level standards in 1-2 years.
 |  |  |  |  |

**Measurement and Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. The school/district has a clearly articulated local assessment plan that includes all of the following (1) screening procedures for all students multiple times per year; (2) diagnostic assessment as needed; (3) a plan for progress monitoring those at risk, and (4) outcomes evaluation at least annually.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The measures identified in the local assessment plan are all reliable and valid for the purposes for which they are used.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., all students tested, accurate scores and cut points/decisions)
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Screening data are used in concert with at least two other data sources (e.g., classroom performance, diagnostic assessment, short-term progress monitoring) to verify decisions about whether a student is at risk.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Professionals are trained to a high degree of reliability in the standard administration and scoring of all assessments used.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Fidelity of assessment administration and scoring procedures is evaluated on a regular basis and refresher trainings are provided as needed.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data are stored in a database that is easily accessible by all teachers and administrators in a timely manner.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A data system is in place that allows users to document and access individual student data and instructional decisions.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A data system is in place that allows for the graphical display of data and supports a process for setting and evaluating goals.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Educators understand and can communicate about the purposes and value of the assessments used, as well as their limitations.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Educators are skilled at interpreting assessment results and making decisions based on these results.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. School-wide assessment data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic and behavior programs.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. School-wide assessment data are used to identify students who may be at risk in academic or social-behavioral areas.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Reliable and valid diagnostic assessments occur as needed to better understand specific needs of identified at-risk students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The school uses valid and reliable progress monitoring tools to monitor the progress of students receiving supplemental or intensive interventions.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Schedules for progress monitoring are set based on the intensity of students’ needs, and assessment occurs at least monthly for all identified students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Progress monitoring tools have sufficient number of alternate forms of equal and controlled difficulty to allow for progress monitoring at recommended intervals.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Progress monitoring tools specificy minimum acceptable growth and provide benchmarks for minimum acceptable end of year performance.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teachers regularly use data from progress monitoring to drive instructional decisions throughout the continuum of supports.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The school evaluates the outcomes of interventions on an annual basis using data to determine effectiveness.
 |  |  |  |  |

**Collaborative Teams**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. Grade level, building level and district level teams exist.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Grade-level, building-level, and district-level teams all consistently follow a problem-solving process with clear procedures to make data based educational decisions that promote improvement in academic and social-behavioral outcomes for all students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. There is common understanding of the purpose and unique roles of each team within the building or district, and of they ways in which these teams interrelate.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All teams are viewed as having the primary mission and responsibility of supporting student success within general education, and not as vehicles to promote special education identification.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Team meetings at all levels are regularly scheduled as part of the school and district master schedules and meetings are of sufficient duration and frequency (e.g., monthly GLT meetings, weekly PST meetings) to complete necessary tasks. All members of teams regularly attend the meetings.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Grade level teams exist and meet regularly in grades K-8, and include all general and special educators who serve students at each grade level, including staff who work with subgroups of students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Building-based problem solving teams exist and have balanced representation from all stakeholders, including general and specialized teaching groups.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Students’ cultural and linguistic needs are taken into account when teams identify and implement interventions and corresponding progress monitoring.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Multiple staff members in grade level and content teams are involved when determining the appropriate type, level, and intensity of interventions for students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All building and district instructional staff are provided with a descriptions of the school/district MTSS and data-based decision-making process.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All building and district instructional staff are updated regularly about changes in the MTSS and data-based decision-making process.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teachers who refer students to a problem solving team meet directly with the team to discuss intervention options and plans.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All team members are trained with regard to procedures, forms, and available resources for their team.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Meeting agendas are clearly communicated and include goals and tasks.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. There is effective facilitation/leadership at each team meeting.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The building administrator actively participates in team meetings.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All team members attend regularly and participate actively during meetings.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All teams maintain records on students they have served
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Effective communication exists between teams.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data on team functioning are collected regularly (number of students served, fidelity to problem solving process).
 |  |  |  |  |

**Problem – Solving Process**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not in Place | Limited Practice | Partially Implemented | Well Established |
| 1. School-wide screening results for academics and behavior are used to identify students for problem solving by grade level or building level teams
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Team members effectively and efficiently identify and prioritize problems for every student or group of students served through intervention services.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The prioritized problem for each student or group of students is observable and measurable and is described as a discrepancy between what is expected and what is occurring as measured on one assessment tool, with additional converging evidence from other sources.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teams generate multiple hypotheses across the domains of instruction, curriculum, environment, and learner (ICEL) when considering the cause of the identified problem.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teams generate hypotheses that are relevant, alterable, and observable.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teams systematically analyze information from a variety of sources (Review, Interview, Observation, Testing) to support or refute each generated hypothesis.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. An individual, specific, and measurable goal is set for each student or group of students.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Interventions selected by the problem-solving team are supported by research.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Interventions selected by the problem-solving team address the student need identified in the discrepancy and hypothesis statements.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intervention plans are implemented in a timely manner.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A plan to gather regular valid and reliable progress monitoring data toward the student goal is a part of each intervention plan.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intervention fidelity is always assessed through direct observation, and any issues are quickly resolved.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intervention sessions are documented and of sufficient intensity, duration and frequency to expect growth.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Teams use decision-making rules to evaluate progress toward goals (e.g., slope vs. trend or consecutive data point rule).
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Decisions about responsiveness to interventions are based on reliable and valid progress monitoring data that reflect progress toward the attainment of a goal at the end of the intervention.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intervention plans are evaluated in a timely manner and resulting decisions are documented.
 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The team cycles through the problem solving process again and again when students’ performance is not sufficiently responsive to the current intervention.
 |  |  |  |  |