

Response To Intervention Case Review Protocol

Student:

School:

Grade:

Standard	Intervention 1	Intervention 2
Problem Identification (C1)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An initial discrepancy was defined in observable measurable terms and was quantified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented Data from at least two sources converge to support the discrepancy statement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student baseline data in the area of concern is collected using a measurement system with sufficient technical adequacy for ongoing frequent measurement, and includes a minimum of 3 data points with standardized procedures for assessment. Baseline data are graphed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Problem Analysis (C2)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data from a variety of sources (RIOT) and domains (ICEL) were collected to consider multiple hypotheses for the cause of the identified discrepancy. These data are documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single hypothesis for the cause of the discrepancy was selected. At least two pieces of data converge to support this hypothesis. At least one of these is quantitative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Plan Development (C3)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A data-based goal was established that describes the learner, conditions (time and materials for responding), expected performance, and a goal date. The goal is indicated on a graph. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intervention selected meets federal definition of scientifically research-based intervention. The selected intervention directly addresses the specific identified problem and the hypothesis for the cause of the discrepancy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A written intervention plan was clearly defined that explicitly describes what will be done, where, when, how often, how long (per session), by whom, and with what resources. Portions of the intervention that are in replacement of and supplemental to the core curriculum are indicated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A written description of the progress-monitoring plan was completed and includes who will collect data, data collection methods, conditions for data collections, and schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A decision making rule was selected for use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A plan evaluation meeting was set for no more than 8 weeks after the plan is established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Plan Implementation (C4)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A direct observation of the intervention was completed at least one time. Any discrepancies between the written plan and the intervention in action were noted and resolved. Observations continued until the intervention being delivered and the written intervention plan matched. Written documentation of each observation was made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team documented agreement that the plan was carried out as intended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team documented agreement that the student participated in the intervention as planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Plan Evaluation (C5)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data were collected and graphed as stated in plan. The required number of data points were collected under the same intervention conditions after integrity was established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team accurately determined and documented the level of student response to intervention on the plan evaluation form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Team decided to continue the plan unmodified, develop a modified plan, fade, or terminate the plan. Team documented this decision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪
Referral for Entitlement Evaluation Decision Guidelines – (to be considered only when all other boxes indicate “YES”)		
A. After implementation of at least two scientifically research-based interventions, student’s slope of growth continues to be below expectation. (See SCRED guidance for assistance with interpretation)		
B. After implementation of at least two scientifically research-based interventions, student’s level of performance continues to be at the 5 th percentile or below compared to state or national norms. (Consider local in addition)		