AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Board Member Participation by Other Means

3. Public Participation

4. Minutes of the December Education Policy Planning Committee Meeting (pp. 2-4)

5. Presentation from Chicago High School for Agricultural Sciences

6. Grow Your Own Update (Linda Jamali, Anne Hallett) (pp. 5-6)

7. State Response to Intervention Plan (Beth Hanselman, Marica Cullen) (pp. 7-19)

8. Illinois College & Work Readiness Partnership (verbal update) (Chris Koch, Susie Morrison)

9. Committee Agenda Planning

10. Adjourn
The Education Policy Planning Committee meeting convened at 10:00 a.m.

1. **ROLL CALL:** Dr. David Fields requested a roll call for attendance purposes. See above.

2. **BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION BY OTHER MEANS:** There was no participation from Board members by any other means.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Dr. Fields introduced Amy Alsop of the Illinois Federation of Teachers and Daryl Morrison of the Illinois Education Association who were present at the EPPC meeting to share support and concern about the statewide implementation of the Response to Intervention (RtI) initiative. They stated that they appreciated the collaborative means by which the plan was developed and support the concept of Response to Intervention. Additionally, they will continue to be actively involved in the process to ensure that quality professional development is available to educators to keep RtI from being an undue burden.

   Dr. Fields recognized Superintendent Roger Thornton and Tim Little of Palatine/Schaumburg HSD 21, who were present to relay concerns with regard to the Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) and the negative impact it is having on their students’ ACT scores. Mr. Thornton stated that it is his position that ACT has thus far been the “gold standard” of testing and those scores have been “trumped” by Work Keys. Mr. Thornton stressed that they believe there should be a progressive alignment/more correlation between ISAT and PSAE beginning at the middle school level. He is very concerned with the 4.4% drop in scores in his district from one year to the next. Mr. Thornton was also concerned about the decision to stop administering the IMAGE to ELL students. Mr. Thornton also requested permission to administer the PSAE to senior students.

4. **MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 2007 EPPC MEETING:** The Committee approved the minutes from the November 2007 EPPC Meeting.

5. **Illinois College and Work Readiness (verbal update) (Chris Koch, Susie Morrison):** Superintendent Chris Koch and Susie Morrison provided the Board with a verbal update. Superintendent Koch addressed concerns raised during the Public Participation portion of the Board Meeting. He provided an update on the work in progress by Achieve. He stated that ISBE must know if our standards address the most critical and relevant standards. Superintendent Koch stated that recommendations for Illinois Math and English/Reading/Language Arts Standards will be forthcoming in January 2008; and Science in February 2008. A report is expected in April or May.
Dr. Koch announced that the negotiations with ACT concerning the cost of the Explore & Plan tests are almost finished. The end result of the negotiation will be to obtain the best possible cost for these tests and the ACT pre-test so the Agency can reimburse districts for the cost of the tests. Dr. Koch also stated that he would like the Board to support continued funding in the FY09 budget for these efforts. Susie Morrison announced that Great Lakes West is working with us to coordinate a meeting with ISBE staff and two other states who have already implemented P-16 or P-20 Councils. Great Lakes will assist in the development of a plan with IBHE, ICCB, ISBE and the Governor’s Office. Superintendent Koch stated that discussions have taken place with IBHE and ICCB regarding a Longitudinal Data System and the use of student identifiers that would allow school districts to communicate with institutions of higher education more efficiently.

6. **Illinois Interactive School Report Card (Connie Wise, Harvey Smith):** Connie Wise introduced Harvey Smith who gave the Board a demonstration of the Illinois Interactive School Report Card. Mr. Smith stated the interactive program was designed to be “user friendly” with “Point and Click” summary reports for every school district in Illinois. Mr. Smith added that the IIRC is logically presented and sequential offering several ways to analyze student, school and district data with simple interactive tools; colorful charts, graphs and scatter plots that visually display data and growth trends. He said that the program offers quick access to learning standards, lesson plans, student work and other classroom resources, up-to-date details on assessment frameworks, performance descriptors and classroom assessments. The site goes beyond simply providing Report Card data. The Interactive School Report Card represents an effective way to use outcome and demographic data. He added that the site will help teachers become comfortable using data. He emphasized that all data contained in this program is classified as public information but that the interface program belongs to NIU.

7. **Educator Supply and Demand Report (Connie Wise):** Connie Wise and Jim Sweeney provided the Board with the results of the 2007 Educator Supply and Demand Annual Report. Dr. Wise stated that the report indicated that retention rates have remained high in 2007 and that the number of re-entries hired has also increased by 42%. Further, student enrollments are expected to peak in 2008 and then will begin to decline. While the downstate workforce increased this year; special education shortages remain. Dr. Wise also reported that unfilled positions have decreased by 6%; however, 55% of those unfilled positions were in Chicago Dist #299 and for the sixth straight year, special education was at the top of the list in terms of both the number of districts reporting a shortage and the severity of the shortages reported. Board member Holmes suggested that the report be provided to IBHE and ICCB.

8. **Preschool for All Annual Report (Kay Henderson):** Kay Henderson was present to share the findings of the Preschool for All Annual Report. Ms. Henderson stated that the Preschool for All program is targeted to assist at-risk children and their families. In October new funding was awarded for the Preschool for All program that is expected to reach approximately 4,000 new children in 2007-08. One hundred percent of the FY 08 funds were awarded to programs serving primarily at-risk children. Ms. Henderson also stated that the approved Preschool for All Funding Report will be submitted to the General Assembly. Jesse Ruiz asked that an addendum to the report be added to show where funds are actually used.

9. **Review Draft State Board Annual Report (Chris Koch, Susie Morrison):** Dr. Koch stated that Susie Morrison assisted in compiling the State Board Annual Report and The Condition of Education in Illinois. The report includes demographic, financial and statistical data. Data that is not available until the end of December was not included but will be added as soon as it becomes available.

Suggestions were made by Joyce Karon and other board members regarding external communication about the report content:
- Include snippets of information in ‘small doses’ to the field to highlight important data
- Add bookmarks in external messages to allow for easy access of specific data
- Raise awareness of the annual report by including references in Superintendent’s Weekly Messages to the field
Dr. Koch added that the Governor and members of the General Assembly will each receive a printed copy of the report. Member Ward reminded the Board that poverty continues to be a serious concern and the annual report highlights the plight of students in poverty conditions.

10. Update on Task Force on Re-Enrolling Students (Jesse Ruiz): Board Chairman Jesse Ruiz was present to update the Board on the current activities of the Task Force on Re-Enrolling Students. Chairman Ruiz stated that members of the task force would be meeting on Friday (December 14, 2007) to review the draft report and that the Board Members will receive a draft copy later today. Mr. Ruiz further stated that the report will be used as a template by the newly formed Re-enrollment Council that will be moving forward to endorse the recommendations in the report. Chairman Ruiz emphasized that the task force’s single focus was on the current 200,000 16 to 19-year old dropouts in the state of Illinois rather than prevention. The report should be finalized in January.

Committee Chairman Fields stated that research has shown that offering differentiated schedules would increase student retention but schools seem to be unwilling to do this. Dr. Fields further stated that he believes that more focus should be placed on student retention rather than re-enrollment.

11. State Response to Intervention Plan (Beth Hanselman, Marica Cullen): Beth Hanselman and Marica Cullen were present to report on the progress of the Response to Intervention Plan. Ms. Hanselman stated that Rene Valenciano and several members of the Special Education staff recently attended the National RtI Summit in Arlington, Virginia. Ms. Hanselman added that the attendees came away with the belief that training and Professional Development are crucial to successful RtI implementation. Ms. Hanselman emphasized that the program will not succeed without appropriate funding, support and resources. The plan represents a beginning process that is fluid and dynamic and the development of state-wide RtI should be continuously monitored for improvement. Marica Cullen reported on details of the summit and shared that she believes Illinois is ahead of other states in the development of plans. Ms. Cullen further stated that RtI is a general education initiative that has profound power to change education throughout the state of Illinois and it should continue to be a highly collaborative process. In January, the plan will be disseminated statewide.

12. Committee Agenda Planning: Suggestions were made by the following Board Members:
   o Andrea Brown: The Board should have a discussion of math and science evaluator expectations.
   o Vinni Hall: There is a need to follow-up on ACT
   o Chris Koch: The Great Lakes Center Report on ISBE Staffing Analysis will be shared with the board prior to the next meeting.

13. ADJOURNMENT: Dr. Hall moved to adjourn the EPPC meeting. Dr. Brown seconded the motion. The EPPC meeting adjourned at 12:21 p.m.
TO: Illinois Education Policy and Planning Committee

FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
       Linda Tomlinson, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent

Agenda Topic: Update on the Grow Your Own Teachers Initiative

Materials: None

Staff Contact(s): Linda Jamali, Division Administrator, Educator Certification
                 Debra Stephens, Principal Consultant, Educator Certification

Purpose of Agenda Item
The Division of Educator Certification will present information profiling the GYO consortia currently operating throughout the State of Illinois.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
GOAL 2: Improving Educator Quality for All Children. The GYO program focuses on recruiting and retaining paraprofessionals and parent volunteers in hard-to-staff schools who are vested in the community to become teachers, in those very same schools.

Expected Outcome(s) of Agenda Item
Information to assist the ISBE as it continues to support this program.

Background Information
The Grow Your Own Teacher Education Act (110 ILCS 48) established the “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative (GYO) to increase the diversity of teachers by race, ethnicity, and disability and prepare them for hard-to-staff positions and hard-to-staff schools in areas serving a substantial percentage of low-income students. The goal of GYO is to train and place 1,000 teachers in hard to staff schools and/or positions by 2016.

Under GYO, funding is available to eligible consortia made up of four-year institutions of higher education that offer state-approved teacher education programs, targeted school districts or schools, and community organizations that seek to offer programs that enable candidates to obtain a bachelor’s degree in education and an Illinois teaching certificate. Working together, these entities are to identify paraprofessionals and parents who have been leaders in schools with hard-to-staff positions, in order to select a cohort of teacher education candidates to begin teacher training. The consortia are charged with the provision of financial and other support to the cohort that will be needed to complete teacher preparation programs. New teachers are placed in positions in the schools targeted by the consortia. The goal is for each cohort member to remain in a hard-to-staff school or position for up to five years upon which any loans incurred during teacher education training will be forgiven.

GYO Illinois is the statewide organization that has been funded under the “Grow Your Own” Teacher Education Initiative to provide technical assistance to the consortia and act as a liaison between the consortia, ISBE, and the Illinois legislature. ISBE has a contract with Philiber and Associates to provide an external evaluation of this program.
Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communications

Policy Implications: GYO Illinois continues to grow in an effort to reach its goal of 1,000 new teachers by 2016.

Budget Implications: ISBE requested $4.5 million for GYO in the FY08 GYO budget, but was allocated $3 million. The board will consider funding for GYO at this Board meeting.

Legislative Action: None

Communication: The handout to be provided in committee may be shared with legislators and any other interested parties.

Pros and Cons of Various Actions
The Grow Your Own Teachers Initiative needs a budget of $4.5 million for FY 09 if it is to continue to meet the needs of the current consortia and produce 1,000 new teachers by 2016.

Superintendent’s Recommendation
N/A

Next Steps
Continue to work with the legislature to obtain appropriate funding for this very successful program.
ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
January 16-17, 2008

TO: Illinois State Board of Education
FROM: Christopher A. Koch, Ed.D., State Superintendent of Education
Elizabeth Hanselman, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education and Support Services

Agenda Topic: State Response to Intervention (RtI) Plan

Materials: Final State RtI Plan

Staff Contact(s): Beth Hanselman, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education & Support Services and Marica Cullen, Division Administrator, Curriculum and Instruction

Purpose of Agenda Item
The purpose of this agenda item is to provide the Board with the Final State RtI Plan which was submitted January 1, 2008.

Relationship to/Implications for the State Board’s Strategic Plan
GOAL 1: Enhancing Literacy
GOAL 2: Improving Educator Quality for All Children
GOAL 3: Expanding Data-Informed School Management and Support Services

Background Information
Agency staff developed the draft Illinois State Response to Intervention (RtI) Plan in a collaborative effort with a number of stakeholder groups, and it evolved from a basic RtI definition to its present conceptual framework. Following the December Board meeting, a draft copy of the plan was posted at http://www.isbe.net/rti.htm, and written comments were accepted at rti@isbe.net. A discussion was held Friday, December 21, 2007, from 10 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

The comments received through this process were thoroughly reviewed by members of the external stakeholder group. The State RtI plan released January 1, 2008 incorporated many of the comments received. A question and answer document is also being prepared to provide additional clarification on questions or issues raised through the process.

Analysis and Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action and Communication
It is anticipated that successful implementation of the State RtI Plan will require the addition of at least one professional position, ideally placed within the Center for Standards and Assessment. Additionally, collaboration with our Public Information division is necessary to develop a coordinated Communication Plan and website to share professional development activities and resources with educators and stakeholders.
Successful implementation of the State RtI Plan will ultimately require additional general revenue funds to cover the professional development and technical assistance costs for statewide implementation. Estimated costs for statewide implementation are 5 million dollars per year. These costs include but are not limited to: training trainers/coaches, reimbursing trainers/coaches for their services, development of the trainings, reimbursement to districts for substitutes and meeting costs.

**Pros and Cons of Various Actions**  
This item is for informational purposes only.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**  
This item is for informational purposes only.

**Next Steps**  
Staff and small stakeholder teams will continue to be actively involved in coordinating professional development activities and securing financial and other resources to ensure successful statewide implementation.
Introduction

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) believes that increased student learning requires the consistent practice of providing high quality instruction matched to student needs. Response to Intervention (RtI) is a general education initiative which requires collaborative efforts from all district staff, general educators, special educators and bilingual/ELL staff. In a quality educational environment student academic and behavioral needs must be identified and monitored continuously with documented student performance data used to make instructional decisions.

The process of such identification and continuous monitoring are the foundational pieces of a successful system of early interventions. The success of all students toward the Illinois Learning Standards is improved when instructional and behavioral goals are frequently monitored. Data derived from such monitoring should then inform instructional strategies gauged to enhance success. It is important to note that it is through the continuous use of progress monitoring and analysis of student academic and behavioral growth that proper instructional and curricular responses may be made.

The proposed state framework supporting the development of a system of scientifically, research based interventions is outlined in the remainder of this document. As districts develop their RtI Plans by January 2009, their plans shall support a fluid model of response to interventions of varying intensity to meet the needs of all students.

What is RtI?

Response to Intervention (RtI) is “the practice of providing 1) high-quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and 2) using learning rate over time and level of performance to 3) make important educational decisions” (Batsche, et al., 2005). This means using differentiated instructional strategies for all learners, providing all learners with scientific, research-based interventions, continuously measuring student performance using scientifically research-based progress monitoring instruments for all learners and making educational decisions based on a student’s response to interventions.

RtI has three essential components: 1) using a three tier model of school supports, 2) utilizing a problem-solving method for decision-making, and 3) having an integrated data system that informs instruction.

1) Three-tier model of school supports: Within an RtI framework, resources are allocated in direct proportion to student needs. This framework is typically depicted as a three-tier model (see Figure 1) that utilizes increasingly more intense instruction and interventions. As Figure 1 shows, Tier 1 is the foundation and consists of scientific, research-based core
instructional and behavioral methodologies, practices and supports designed for all students in the general curriculum. At Tier 2, supplemental instruction and interventions are provided in addition to core instruction to those students for whom data suggest additional instructional support is warranted. Tier 3 consists of intensive instructional interventions provided in addition to core instruction with the goal of increasing an individual student’s rate of progress.

**Figure 1. Three-Tier Model of School Supports**

![Three-Tier Model Diagram](image)

Adapted from *Response to Intervention: Policy Considerations and Implementation (Batsche, et al 2005)*. Note: Percentages are approximations and may vary by district.

2) Problem-solving method of decision-making: Across the tiers, the problem solving method is used to match instructional resources to educational need. The problem-solving method (see figure 2) is as follows:

(a) Define the problem by determining the discrepancy between what is expected and what is occurring.
(b) Analyze the problem using data to determine why the discrepancy is occurring.
(c) Establish a student performance goal, develop an intervention plan to address the goal and delineate how the student’s progress will be monitored and implementation integrity will be ensured.
(d) Use progress monitoring data to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention plan.

**Figure 2. Steps of Problem Solving**

1. Problem Identification
2. Problem Analysis
3. Intervention Planning
4. Progress Monitoring


3) Integrated data collection that informs instruction: Within an RtI model, progressively more intensive interventions and supports are coupled with more frequent progress monitoring of student achievement in order to guide the educational planning. At Tier 1 data are collected and are used as a general screening process for all students and to determine effectiveness of core instructional practices. At Tier 2 data are collected to determine the effectiveness of the intervention and determine if an instructional change is needed. At Tier 3, data are collected for the same reasons as Tier 2, but are collected on a more frequent basis so that educational decisions can be made in a timelier manner. Data systems used for screening and progress monitoring within an RtI model should be consistent across all three tiers and be scientifically-based.

It is important to note that RtI within a three-tier intervention model is also a part of special education eligibility decision-making required by 34 CFR 300.309 and 23 IAC 226.130.

A successful Illinois State RtI plan establishes a framework to meet the diverse needs of all students. Therefore, the framework of this plan is designed to provide training and implementation flexibility in light of the variation that exists across districts, schools and age levels. For example, variations in knowledge and experience with implementing RtI will influence the type and amount of training and technical assistance a district or school may need. With regard to instructional and assessment practices, RtI components such as universal screening and scientific, research-based interventions may take different forms at different grade levels. While it is not possible to address all potential variations within this plan, the framework contained herein can serve as a foundation to support comprehensive training and implementation of sound educational practices.

**Progress Monitoring and Data Collection**

As illustrated in Figure 1, RtI encompasses a three-tier process of increasingly intensive instructional interventions put in place in response to frequent progress monitoring indicating that a student’s academic and/or behavioral needs are not being met in the current instructional program. Such continuous monitoring leads to responsive levels of intervention matched to the
student’s demonstrated academic and behavior achievement and rate of growth. In a fully implemented response to intervention model a student may move fluidly from tier to tier as a result of his/her response to the educational program.

**Special Education Eligibility Considerations**

When implementing an RtI process, school teams use student progress data collected at each tier to document a student’s response to scientific, research-based interventions as part of the evaluation process in order to consider eligibility for special education services. Such eligibility decisions typically occur within Tier 3 when students do not respond to the most intensive interventions, but may occur at any tier. It is also important to note that, a parent may request an evaluation at any point during this intervention process.

By the 2010-2011 school year, documentation of the RtI process shall be a part of the evaluation process for students when a specific learning disability (SLD) is suspected. After implementing an RtI process, a district may use a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement as part of the evaluation process for determining whether a child has a specific learning disability.

The ISBE recognizes that some districts are currently further along in the implementation of RtI and may implement this process prior to the 2010-2011 school year. Additionally, the RtI process may be used as part of the evaluation process for students considered for eligibility in other disability areas.

Further refinement of the implementation of RtI and its role in eligibility determination will continue through a work group comprised of representatives from multiple statewide stakeholder groups (e.g. Illinois State Board of Education, teacher unions, special education directors, school administrators, parent advocacy groups, related service providers, general educators, special educators, and bilingual/ELL educators, etc.)
## Crosswalk of RtI, NCLB 2001, *Reading First*, and IDEA 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RtI</th>
<th>NCLB 2001</th>
<th>Reading First</th>
<th>IDEA 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement of Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Provides a schoolwide model of integrated instruction, assessment, and data-based decision making to improve student outcomes.</td>
<td>Requires that all students reach high standards in reading, math, and science and graduate from high school.</td>
<td>Focuses on increased reading achievement for students in Grades K-3.</td>
<td>Improves educational outcomes for students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Program Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Requires both horizontal and vertical alignment of instructional practices, screening, and monitoring.</td>
<td>Requires an integrated instruction and assessment system.</td>
<td>Requires the use of scientifically based instruction and assessment in the essential components of reading from Grade K-3, including supplemental support for students with reading difficulties.</td>
<td>Requires the use of research-based interventions, progress monitoring, accountability, and access to the general curriculum, as well as alignment of transition services with post-school opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Capacity</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on schoolwide systems requires greater collaboration of teachers and staff to coordinate efforts of instructional delivery, assessment, and decision making.</td>
<td>Requires data collection and evaluation to determine adequate yearly progress.</td>
<td>Emphasizes capacity building through its focus on procuring instructional materials and providing professional development for K-3 teachers in the essential components of reading instruction.</td>
<td>Encourages capacity building through the inclusion of an early-intervening services provision that includes interventions to students at risk and related professional development for teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Process for Statewide Implementation

The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) will:

- Develop a Frequently Asked Question document and post it on the ISBE website
- Establish an inclusive committee of stakeholders to review the progress of statewide implementation of RtI including funding sources and professional development.
Stakeholder groups could include the Illinois State Board of Education, teacher unions, administrator organizations, parent advocacy groups, special education directors,
Regional Offices of Education, Illinois Advisory Council on Bilingual Education and higher education institutions.

- Collaborate with Illinois ASPIRE, stakeholder groups and practitioners, to develop and disseminate guidance on requirements for special education eligibility determination.
- Identify districts that would most benefit from greater assistance from the State in implementing RtI (23 IAC 226.140(b)(3)(a)). Variables to be considered in making this determination include, but are not limited to, NCLB status, percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch, severe staff shortages, financial watch status, significant disproportionality in special education and district size.
- Assist all districts, with specific assistance for targeted districts, in completing a District Self-Assessment (template to be provided by ISBE) to determine their “Next Steps” toward implementation of response to intervention for all learners.
- Work with district administrators and staff representing both general and special education, such as those involved in curriculum & instruction, bilingual education, professional development, etc, to reinforce their leadership and implementation roles in the RtI process.
- Oversee and coordinate the provision of professional development to assist districts in the development and implementation of a plan for Response to Intervention (RtI). (e.g., Illinois ASPIRE, the Illinois Statewide Technical Assistance Center [ISTAC], Regional Support Providers [RESPROS], Intermediate Service Center [ISCs], Regional Offices of Education [ROEs]), Institutions of Higher Education [IHEs], and special education joint agreements/cooperatives)
- Oversee and coordinate the provision of ongoing technical assistance to districts as requested. (e.g., Illinois ASPIRE, ISTAC, RESPROS, ISCbs, ROEs, Illinois Resource Center [IRC] and special education joint agreements/cooperatives)
- Work with IHEs to incorporate the necessary skill development in undergraduate and graduate coursework in the education departments.
- Educate parent groups (PTIs, PTAs, Bilingual PACs, etc.) about what RtI is, why it is being implemented in school districts and how parents will be involved.
- Evaluate the effects of the RtI process and activities through review of student outcomes and professional development training reviews. Sources may include Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profiles, District and School Improvement Plans and professional development plans.
- Disseminate resources and information (e.g. middle and high school implementation, ELL implementation) across the state through conferences, workshops, web-based resources, newsletters and parent organizations.

Districts will, based on self-assessment results (template provided by ISBE) and, in conjunction with the District Improvement Plan process, develop an RtI plan that addresses:

- A process for gathering baseline information regarding current resources and practices addressing problem solving, scientific, research-based instruction, progress monitoring, ongoing assessment and levels of interventions.
- How current resources and practices will be used to implement RtI and identify what additional resources are necessary to implement the district plan.
- How district stakeholders will be educated on what is RtI.
- How district stakeholders (e.g., teacher organization leadership, parent organization leadership) will be involved in the process.
• How the district leadership (e.g., school board, district- and building-level administrators,) will be involved in plan development and implementation.
• What ongoing professional development for all administrative, instructional and student support staff is needed to implement and sustain RtI and how it will be delivered.
• What infrastructure components are necessary (e.g., problem solving process, data collection), and which of those components is already in place or may need to be developed or strengthened.
• How the district will apply state guidelines in establishing the use of RtI in the special education eligibility process.
• How the district process will involve parents in the training and implementation of RtI.
• How the RtI plan is connected to other district initiatives and plans (e.g., District Improvement Plans (DIP), Technology, Professional Development).
• What additional training needs, guidance and policy changes are necessary.
• How a systematic problem solving process will be used to make educational decisions.
• What systemic data management tools will be used for review and analysis of student data to make educational decisions.
• What evaluation process will be used to determine the effectiveness of RtI and the frequency with which that evaluation process will be used.

Implementation Timelines

Spring 2008

• Each district will complete a District Self-Assessment (template provided by ISBE) to determine its “Next Steps” in the development and implementation of their RtI plans for all learners.
• ISBE will provide technical assistance and support to all districts in the implementation of RtI.
• ISBE will identify targeted districts that would most likely benefit from greater assistance from the State.

Spring/Summer 2008

ISBE will utilize its grant-funded training and technical assistance initiatives and other available resources as appropriate, including but not limited to, Illinois ASPIRE, ISTAC, RESPROs, ISCs, ROEs special education cooperatives, IRC, IHEs, regional labs, and Reading First, to deliver intensive training and ongoing support to professional development trainers/coaches on the problem solving process, the three-tier intervention model using RtI and coaching techniques. Training resources may include, but are not limited to, the Illinois ASPIRE training modules (see Supporting Resources).

The Trainers/Coaches will focus their technical assistance and coaching to those districts within their region most in need of assistance. The technical assistance (TA) will take the form of face-to-face TA, Web-based TA and telephone/email communication. Regularly scheduled TA meetings will assist and support district teams. Trainers/Coaches with a broad array of skills and experience in RtI, problem solving and enhancing educational programming will conduct intensive ongoing training.
2008-2009 School Year

Trainers/Coaches will conduct RtI training for districts within their region, or districts will identify a team to send to various trainings throughout the year. The trainings will address such topics as:

- Overview of 3-Tier Problem Solving Model
- Scientific, Research-Based Assessments for Progress Monitoring and Universal Screening
- Problem Identification
- Scientific, Research-Based interventions
- Leadership and Teaming in a Response to Intervention and Problem Solving System
- Parent Involvement in Response to Intervention

2009-2010 School Year

Trainers/Coaches will conduct RtI training for districts within their region. In addition to the 2008-2009 training topics, these trainings will be targeted specifically to the needs of the districts within the region and will address topics such as:

- Scientifically-Based Instruction and Interventions
- Curriculum Based Measures
- Progress Monitoring Instruments
- Effective Use of RtI in Special Education Eligibility Determination
- Advanced Problem Analysis
- ELL Implementation
- Middle and High school Implementation

Planning for Costs

When planning for training and ongoing implementation, districts should anticipate fiscal needs in relation to, but not limited to, the following areas as identified in their district’s self-assessment:

- Substitutes for staff to participate in training
- Release time for staff for ongoing collaboration, planning and implementation
- Registration fees for regional training
- Resource needs: review of core curriculum and assessment practices, review of school wide behavioral practices, interventions, progress monitoring tools and coaching support, etc.

Funding Sources

Districts have the responsibility and flexibility to align available resources to support the full implementation of their RtI plan. Districts are encouraged to plan for the possible use of the following funding sources to support training and implementation of the critical plan components.
Federal Funds:

Title I
Title II
Title III
IDEA

Title funds, under certain circumstances, can be used to help support the district RtI plan. The cost of professional development can be shared among several federal programs. It is our current understanding that, because the State is not mandating particular interventions, resources and materials, and districts have the flexibility to choose district-appropriate interventions, resources and materials, Title I paid staff can assist in working with identified students to provide intervening services; and resources and materials may be shared among programs. Title II funds designated for professional development could be used to support RtI implementation. Title III funds may be used to support supplemental services for ELL students.

Federal IDEA Part B Dollars

Currently, districts are required to allocate 5 percent of their IDEA Part B flow-through funds for professional development. This allocation may be used for training to support implementation of the RtI plan.

Districts may also use up to 15 percent of special education funds to support implementation of the RtI plan, i.e., to develop and implement scientific, research-based interventions for students in grades K-12 not identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in the general education environment. Only those districts determined to have significant disproportionality based on race/ethnicity in the identification, placement or discipline of students with disabilities must use 15 percent of their funds for this purpose. Funds may be used to:

1) Deliver professional development (which may be provided by entities other than the LEA) for teachers and other school staff to enable such personnel to deliver scientific, research-based academic and behavioral interventions, including scientifically-based literacy instruction, and, where appropriate, instruction on the use of adaptive and instructional software.
2) Provide information and training for parents.
3) Provide educational and behavioral evaluations and assessments, services and supports, including scientifically-based literacy instruction.

General Funds:

District general funds can be used to support implementation of the RtI plan.
ISBE Funding Opportunities

ISBE will continue to pursue funding from other sources, including general revenue funds and grant opportunities.

ISBE will assist schools identified as least likely to effectively implement RtI for all students by coordinating professional development opportunities and trainers/coaches to support the work of district and school implementation teams.

**ISBE Evaluation Plan**

The ISBE evaluation process of the implementation of RtI and its effects on student outcomes will be structured around key evaluation questions:

1) If people are trained, do they implement?
2) If they implement, do they do so with integrity/fidelity?
3) If they implement with integrity/fidelity, do they sustain that level of implementation?
4) If implementation is sustained, what is the impact on student outcomes?
5) Is appropriate support offered from all levels to support full implementation (e.g. ISBE, districts, RESPROs,ISCs, ROEs, IHEs, special education cooperatives, etc.)?

The following areas will be a part of the state evaluation of RtI implementation and the district improvement planning process. Many of these areas of focus involve student data that is currently collected at local, regional and state levels.

1) Skill development and implementation of educators.
2) Satisfaction of educators and parents based on survey results.
3) Evaluation of training and technical assistance.
4) Impact on students on the following variables:
   a. Achievement,
   b. Behavior,
   c. Referral rates,
   d. Disproportionality rates,
   e. Drop out rates
   f. Graduation rates
   g. Attendance
   h. Special education placement rates, and
   i. Retention
5) The relationship between implementation integrity and student outcomes.
Supporting Resources

ISBE will make additional resources available to assist school districts through the agency website. Currently, the website to support these resources is under development. Once the website is operational, notice will be provided in the Superintendent’s Bulletin. This website will be updated on an ongoing basis.

Frequently Asked Questions (to be developed based on questions raised during the public comment period and any further funding information received from the United States Department of Education)
Guidelines for Eligibility Determinations (to be developed)
District Self-Assessment (Template to be provided by ISBE)
Examples of Reviewed Reading Strategies
Examples of Reviewed Math Strategies
Examples of Reviewed ELL Strategies
Examples for Middle School Implementation
Examples for Secondary Implementation
Example of a District Improvement Plan incorporating RtI
Example of Universal Screening Instruments
ASPIRE Training Modules/Evaluation summary
Problem Solving Steps across Tiers (Batsche, et al., 2005)
Glossary of Terms
Bibliography – NASDSE, IDEA,
NCLB/IDEA language excerpts
Link to IASA and IPA websites