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Session Goals

Participants will:

• Gain knowledge about the similarities and differences between Georgia’s Systems of Continuous Improvement, Federal Programs, and Georgia’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

• Examine the essential components of MTSS, the impact of fidelity and the evaluation of effectiveness

• Integrate Federal Programs and Georgia’s MTSS to develop the CLIP and to sustain continuous improvement
Integrating the Essential Components of Georgia’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) with Georgia’s Systems of Continuous Improvement

- Screening
- Progress Monitoring
- Data-Based Decision Making
- Multi-Level Prevention System
- Infrastructure

Supporting All Students
Focus on Opportunities for ALL Children

"We are true to our creed when a little [child] born into the bleakest poverty knows that [he/she] has the same chance to succeed as anybody else."

— Barack Obama
Focus on Opportunities for ALL Children

• Despite district and school leaders’ best efforts, minority students, low-income students, English learners, students with disabilities, and those who are homeless or in foster care are more likely to fail math and reading and are less likely to graduate.

• The achievement gap is the difference in the performance between the subgroups within a participating LEA or school and the statewide average performance of the LEA's or State's highest achieving subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics as measured by the assessments required under the ESEA.
Focus on Opportunities for ALL Children

In order to resolve the achievement gap, the focus cannot be on treating all students the same and must be replaced with efforts that advance educational opportunities, ensuring all students have the resources to make it possible to graduate prepared for success after high school.
Focus on Opportunities for ALL Children

Do all people wear the same size shoes? Why not? What would happen if everyone was forced to wear size 7 shoes?
The Law – ESSA – Section 1112(b)(2)

To ensure that all children receive a high-quality education, and to close the achievement gap between children meeting the challenging State academic standards and those children who are not meeting such standards, each local educational agency plan shall describe--

1. How the local educational agency will monitor students' progress in meeting the challenging State academic standards by--
   A. developing and implementing a well-rounded program of instruction
   B. identifying students who may be at risk
   C. providing additional educational assistance to students identified as at risk
   D. identifying and implementing instructional and other strategies intended to strengthen academic programs and improve school conditions
Georgia’s Continuous Improvement Cycle

Using Georgia’s Continuous Improvement Cycle to develop your plan for improvement.

- Comprehensive Needs Assessment
- Identify Root Causes
- Overarching Needs – Action Steps
- Develop a Plan for Interventions
- Implement the Plan
- Reexamine the Data
Consolidated LEA Improvement Plan

• The Consolidated LEA Improvement Plan (CLIP) is submitted to the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) each year from LEAs. The CLIP defines how the LEAs will support their students when accepting federal funds under The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015.

• Once developed, submitted and approved this plan will guide the work of the LEA for the entire year. However, LEAs can adjust the CLIP as the need arises throughout the year.
Consolidated LEA Improvement Plan

- Comprehensive Needs Assessment District Report
  - Planning and Preparation
    - Identification of Team
    - Identification of Stakeholders

- Parent and Family Engagement

- District Improvement Plan
  - Overarching Needs
  - Goals
  - Achievement Gap/Interventions
  - Actions Steps
    - Funding Sources
    - Subgroups
    - Systems of Continuous Improvement
    - Monitoring for Implementation
    - Monitoring for Effectiveness
    - Evidence Based
    - Timeline for Implementation
    - Position/Role Responsible
Data-Driven Decision Making

Data-driven decision making refers to an LEA and/or school’s ongoing process of collecting and analyzing multiple sources of formative and summative data, such as demographic, student achievement, Georgia Milestones, End-of-Pathway, ACCESS, attendance (student & staff), staff turnover, discipline/behavior, engagement, common assessments, school climate, stakeholder perception, graduation rate, and college enrollment data to guide decisions toward improvement of the educational process. DDDM involves making decisions that are supported by data rather than making decisions that are intuitive or based on observation alone.
Identify Priorities and Create SMART Goals

1. Summarize Data
   Identify the strengths and challenges from the data analysis

2. Prioritize Needs
   Identify and prioritize overarching needs

3. Analyze Root Causes
   Conduct a root cause analysis

4. Develop Goals
   Develop SMART goals

5. Select Interventions
   Determine solutions
By the end of FY22, Happy School District will implement differentiated reading instruction and increase the percentage of students scoring at proficient learner or above on the English Language Arts GA Milestones from 50% to 55%.
What is Georgia’s MTSS?

Georgia’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a framework that:

• incorporates 5 essential components;
• is data driven;
• includes a team approach;
• supports ALL students in learning; and
• is considered best practice for teaching and learning.
Successful Implementation of MTSS

**Design**

- Screening
- Data-Based Decision Making
- Progress Monitoring
- Multi-Level Prevention System

**Infrastructure**

- Prevention Focus
- Leadership
- Professional Learning
- Schedules
- Resources
- Family and Community Engagement
- Communication with & Involvement of All Staff
- Effective Teaming
- Cultural Linguistic Responsiveness

**Implementation**

MTSS Overview, Tessie Rose Bailey, August 2020
Screening

• Identify students who need enrichment/acceleration or who are at risk for poor learning and/or poor behavior outcomes and provide an indicator of system effectiveness
• Use screening data in concert with at least two other data sources
Progress Monitoring

• Monitor students’ response to secondary or tertiary intervention in order to:
  o Estimate rates of improvement across time,
  o Identify students who are not demonstrating adequate progress,
  o Compare the efficacy of different forms of academic and/or behavior instruction, and
  o Determine when instructional change is needed.
Multi-Level Prevention System

• Tier I: Primary Level – Instruction/Core Curriculum
  o ALL students – Is the core instructional program meeting the academic and behavioral needs of most students (e.g., 80% of students)?

• Tier II: Secondary Level – Targeted Intervention
  o Students identified through screening and at least two other data sources who need enrichment/acceleration or who are at risk for poor learning and behavioral outcomes

• Tier III: Tertiary Level - Intensive Intervention
  o Students who have not responded to primary or secondary level of prevention (SST)
Georgia’s Multi-Level Prevention System

Tier I: Primary Level of Prevention – Instruction/Core Curriculum

Tier II: Secondary Level of Prevention - Intervention

Tier III: Tertiary Level of Prevention – Intensive Intervention

Students receive services at all levels, depending on need.
Data-Based Decision Making

• Analyze data at all levels of MTSS
  - Implementation e.g., state, district, school, grade level
  - Prevention e.g., primary, secondary or tertiary
• Use data to evaluate effectiveness of:
  - Core Curriculum
  - Instruction and behavioral intervention/strategies
• Movement within the Multi-Level Prevention System
Essential Components of Georgia’s MTSS

- Screening
- Progress Monitoring
- Multi-Level Prevention System
  - Tier I: Primary Level – Instruction/Core Curriculum
  - Tier II: Secondary Level – Targeted Intervention
  - Tier III: Tertiary Level - Intensive Intervention
- Data-Based Decision Making
  - Identify instructional needs for academics and/or behavior
  - Evaluate the effectiveness of core curriculum, instruction, interventions and the framework
  - Determine movement within the multi-level system
- Infrastructure and Support Mechanisms
Common Elements

• All children
• Needs of the whole child
• Evidence based practices and interventions
• Focus on closing the gap, etc.

• Can you think of others? Type them in the Question box.
Essential Components: Infrastructure

Knowledge, resources and organizational structures necessary to operationalize all components of the framework in a unified system to meet the established goals

- Prevention Focus
- Leadership
- Professional Learning
- Schedules
- Resources

- Family and Community Engagement
- Communication with and Involvement of All Staff
- Effective Teaming
- Cultural Linguistic Responsiveness
By the end of FY22, Happy School District will implement differentiated reading instruction and increase the percentage of students scoring at proficient learner or above on the English Language Arts GA Milestones from 50% to 55%.
Indicators of Tier 1 Concerns

- Less than 75-80% of students are identified as at or above grade level expectation on identified measures.
- Inconsistent performance across classrooms, grades, or schools.
- Poor attendance, low student engagement, and/or frequent behavior problems.
- High rates of students (>20%) identified for supplemental support.
- Differential benefit across subpopulations.
- Low teacher satisfaction or engagement.
What is Tier I?

- District curriculum and instructional practices that are evidence-based, aligned with state or district standards, and incorporate differentiated instruction
- Designed to meet the diverse needs of its learners
- Includes everything that is NOT “intervention”. For example,
  - Core academic and behavior curriculum and instruction
  - Schedule
  - Teacher-student interaction
  - School culture
  - Standards
  - State- and district-requirements
  - Technology and resources
High-Leverage Practices (HLPs)

- Fundamental to effective teaching
- Cut across content domains and grade levels
- Used frequently
- Supported by research

Tessie Rose Bailey, PhD, American Institutes for Research, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): Building a Robust Tiered Prevention System Through Evidence-based Practices, October 2018
Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs)

- Are Content Specific
- Developmentally Appropriate
- Learner Dependent
- Supported by Research

Tessie Rose Bailey, PhD, American Institutes for Research, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS): Building a Robust Tiered Prevention System Through Evidence-based Practices, October 2018
Tier I District Level Considerations

Design

• Adopts/purchases research-based curriculum materials (research includes subgroups)
• Articulates teaching and learning (in and across grade levels)
• Aligns core curriculum with state standards
• Provides resources, e.g., personnel, time, materials, programs for effective implementation
  • Prioritizes time for data review, analysis and problem solving
  • Protects time for student learning

Delivery

• Creates protocols, procedures and/or processes to monitor the fidelity of implementation and evaluate effectiveness
• Ensures implementation with all students – all subgroups as well as those exceeding benchmark
What knowledge, resources and organizational structures are needed to operationalize a multi-level prevention system and increase the percentage of students scoring at proficient or above on the ELA Milestones?
Multi-Level Prevention System

Significant and persistent learning needs, nonresponders (3%-5%)

Students identified as at risk (~15%-20%)

All students

Tier I: Comprehensive, research-based ELA curriculum

Tier II: Standardized, targeted intervention

Tier III: Intensive intervention individualized based on student data

Students receive services at all levels, depending on need.
Essential Components: Infrastructure

Knowledge, resources and organizational structures necessary to operationalize all components of the framework in a unified system to meet the established goals

- Prevention Focus
- Leadership
- Professional Learning
- Schedules
- Resources
- Family and Community Engagement
- Communication with and Involvement of All Staff
- Effective Teaming
- Cultural Linguistic Responsiveness
Subcomponents of Infrastructure

• Professional Learning (PL)
  • What knowledge, resources and organizational structures are needed to institutionalize and structure PL so that all teachers and leaders continuously examine, reflect upon and improve
    o instructional practice,
    o data-based decision making, and
    o delivery of interventions?

• Resource Allocation (personnel, time, materials, programs)
  • To meet established goal, what resources are needed to design and implement a multi-level prevention system?
EasyRetro Activity

https://easyretro.io/publicboard/wzZrEi77HjStob4LZEJhocczgUc2/4a9fd0a1-f764-4805-9656-c53f7a2bd5d0
Fidelity of Implementation
Elements of Fidelity

**Student Engagement:** How engaged and involved are the students in this intervention or activity?

**Program specificity:** How well is the intervention defined and different from other interventions?

**Adherence:** How well do we stick to the plan, curriculum, or assessment?

**Exposure/Duration:** How often does a student receive an intervention? How long does an intervention last?

**Quality of Delivery:** How well is the intervention, assessment, or instruction delivered? Do you use good teaching practices?

Dane & Schneider, 1998; Gresham et al., 1993; O’Donnell, 2008
Program Effectiveness

“Discovering what works does not solve the problem of program effectiveness. Once models and best practices are identified, practitioners are faced with the challenge of implementing programs properly. A poorly implemented program can lead to failure as easily as a poorly designed one.”

Mihalic, Irwin, Fagan, Ballard, & Elliott, 2004
Program Implementation vs Program Effectiveness

Action Step 1:
Implement Evidenced Based ELA Intervention Programs

Methods for Implementation
- Usage Report
- Intervention Schedules

Methods for Effectiveness
- Classroom Observations
- Formative Assessments
Evaluating and Monitoring Implementation Fidelity

- CLIP action steps
- MTSS implementation
- Tier I instruction
- Tier II and Tier III intervention
- Professional Learning
- Allocation/Implementation/Effectiveness of Resources
Reflect and Respond

• How does knowledge gained about the integration of Georgia’s Systems of Continuous Improvement, Federal Programs and Georgia’s MTSS impact the development of the CLIP?

• Type a brief response in the Question box.
Resources
Georgia’s Tiered System of Supports for Students

"A Multi-tiered System of Supports will create a multi-dimensional view of the role schools have played in the past and help create a new multi-dimensional view in which schools, families, and communities work together to support all students."

Monday Smith, coordinator of Student Services
Houston County Board of Education

Georgia’s MTSS Website: www.gadoe.org/mtss

Contact Information
Karen S. Suddeth, Ed.S.
Program Manager
Office Phone: 404-656-6058
Cell Phone: 404-548-4348
Email: ksuddeth@doe.k12.ga.us

Carole C. Carr
Communications Specialist
Office Phone: 404-232-7986
Cell Phone: 404-519-9998
Email: ccarr@doe.k12.ga.us
Staff Contact List

Please email questions to gamtss@doe.k12.ga.us
Follow us on Twitter: @GeorgiaMTSS
High Leverage Practices (HLPs)

Teaching Works: High Leverage Practices (Ball):
http://www.teachingworks.org/work-of-teaching/high-leverage-practices

High-Leverage Practices in Special Education:

CEEDAR Center- HLP Crosswalk with PSEL:
Evidence-based Practices (EBPs): IES Practice Guides

- Across multiple academic subjects
- Early childhood to post-secondary
- Special populations

- Includes:
  - Summary of research evidence
  - Summary of supported practices with examples
  - Recommendations for addressing educational issue.
  - Additional resources: tips for implementation, videos, and fidelity checklists

https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuides
LEA Consolidated Application

CLIP Resources

- FY22 Consolidated LEA Improvement Plan (CLIP) Guidance
- GaDOE Continuous Improvement Teams (CIT)
- FY22 Streamlined CLIP (S-CLIP) Questions Template
- FY22 CLIP Review Criteria
- FY22 Parent and Family Engagement Policy
- FY22 Equity Action Plan Template
- FY22 Foster Care Transportation Plan Template
- FY22 Title I Part C ID&R Plan Template
- Progress Monitoring Application - Navigation Guide
- Equity - Sample Quick Guide
- Components of the CLIP – Equity Action Plan
- LEA CLIP Stakeholder and Team List
- FY22 CLIP Online Blank Copy
- FY22 CLIP IDEA Performance Goals Tips
Resources to Support Identification of High Leverage Practices (HLPs) and Evidence-based Practices (EBPs)

• What Works Clearinghouse: What works Clearinghouse is a central source of scientific evidence for what works in education [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/]

• IES Practice Guides: Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Practice Guides are subjected to rigorous external peer review and consist of recommendations, strategies, and indications of the strength of evidence supporting each recommendation [https://eric.ed.gov/]

• Best Evidence Encyclopedia: Best Evidence Encyclopedia offers information to improve learning for students in grades K-12 and particularly targets students in mathematics, special needs/diverse learners, and English language learners [http://www.bestevidence.org/?ad=6]

• IRIS Center: [http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/ebp_summaries/]

• CEEDAR Center: [http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/]

• Evidence-based Intervention Network: [http://ebi.missouri.edu/]

Resources for Evaluating Evidence Base of Practices and Standardized Interventions

- Evidence for ESSA: [http://www.evidenceforessa.org](http://www.evidenceforessa.org)
# Fidelity of Implementation Rubrics

## Georgia’s Tiered System of Supports for Students

### District Fidelity of Implementation Rubric

Georgia’s Tiered System of Supports for Students District Fidelity of Implementation Rubric is for use by individuals level fidelity of Georgia’s Tiered System of Supports for Students implementation. The rubric is aligned with the and the infrastructure that is necessary for successful implementation. It is accompanied by a worksheet with guiding questions and score points for use in an interview with the leadership team.

### School Fidelity of Implementation Rubric

Georgia’s Tiered System of Supports for Students School Fidelity Rubric is for use by individuals who are responsible for monitoring school-level fidelity of Tiered System of Supports for Students implementation. The rubric is aligned with the essential components of a tiered system of support and the infrastructure that is necessary for successful implementation. It is accompanied by a worksheet with guiding questions and score points for use in an interview with the leadership team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Assessments
- Screening, progress monitoring, and other supporting assessments are used to inform data-based decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### A. Screening Tools
- Insufficient evidence that the screening tools are reliable, correlations between the instruments and valued outcomes are strong, and predictions of risk status are accurate.
- Evidence indicates that the screening tools are reliable, correlations between the instruments and valued outcomes are strong, and predictions of risk status are accurate, but staff is unable to articulate the supporting evidence.
- Evidence indicates that the screening tools are reliable, correlations between the instruments and valued outcomes are strong, and predictions of risk status are accurate, but staff is unable to articulate the supporting evidence.

#### B. Universal Screening
- One or none of the following conditions is met: (1) screening is conducted for all students (i.e., universal); (2) procedures are in place to ensure implementation accuracy (i.e., all
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Feedback

Please complete our workshop survey:

- Go here: https://form.jotform.com/211754158308961

- Or scan this QR code: 

Click here and follow the NEW Federal Programs/ESSA IDEA Facebook page!
Or scan this QR Code: