

Part Two

Student Case Studies

In the following examples, we highlight data from individual elementary-school students who have received early reading (and limited math) interventions through a multi-tiered RTI service-delivery model. These data are from real students in real-world circumstances; consequently, the information collected, as well as the data collection process, reflect variations initiated by the students' respective school and the unique characteristics of individual students. We have altered the names and other uniquely identifying information about student characteristics for confidentiality purposes.

CASE STUDY: BRYANNA

READING: THIRD GRADE (2005 – 2006)

Bryanna is an 8-year-old, Caucasian female. She is in third grade and has not been retained.

THIRD GRADE (2005 – 2006)

TIER 1

Bryanna is in a general education class of 17 students. Her general education (Tier 1) reading instruction takes place for 90 minutes each day, five

days a week, with Scholastic Literacy Place. The class is split into smaller reading groups, and Bryanna is in a reading group of six students.

Tier 1 Screening. The school administered DIBELS in August 2005 and again in December 2005. Table 5.1 shows Bryanna's scores compared to the established cut scores.

Table 5.1. Bryanna's Tier 1 Screening Scores

Assessment	Bryanna's Scores	Some Risk Cut Score
DIBELS		
FALL ORF	41	< 77
FALL RTF	17	< 38
MID-YEAR ORF	64	< 92
MID-YEAR RTF	44	< 46

DIBELS Scoring is as follows:

- DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) = number of correct words per minute from the passage
- DIBELS Retell Fluency (RTF) is intended to provide a comprehension check for the DIBELS ORF assessment

Section 5: School Examples, Student Case Studies, & Research Examples

Behavior. This school uses a district behavior discipline form to gather school-wide behavior data. No behavior concerns were noted for Bryanna.

TIER 2

Tier 2 interventions. Bryanna began receiving Tier 2 interventions in second grade, and they continued into third grade, as follows:

- SRA Reading Mastery II and Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing (LiPS) with the special education teacher for 60 minutes each day, five days a week.

- Bryanna is also being tutored for 50 minutes twice a week. She is in a group with six other students and is working on Balanced Literacy using non-fiction readers.

Tier 2 progress monitoring. Table 5.2 shows Bryanna’s progress monitoring scores for oral reading fluency and retell fluency measures. The table also notes the established cut scores for designating a child as at some risk in these areas.

Table 5.2. DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) and Retell Fluency (RTF)

Date	Bryanna’s ORF Scores	At Some Risk ORF Cut Scores	Bryanna’s RTF Scores	At Some Risk RTF Cut Scores
Sept. Week 1	41	< 77	17	< 38
Sept. Week 3	56		35	
Oct. Week 1	47		16	
Oct. Week 4	64		28	
Nov. Week 2	62		32	
Nov. Week 4	Absent		Absent	
Dec. Week 2	64	< 92	44	< 46
Jan. Week 2	88		9	
Jan. Week 4	100		54	
Feb. Week 1	73		0	
End of year		< 110		< 55

MATH: THIRD GRADE (2005 – 2006)

THIRD GRADE (2005 – 2006)

TIER 1

Bryanna is in a general education class of 17 students for math. Her general education (Tier 1) math instruction takes place for 60 minutes each day, five days a week, with Houghton-Mifflin Central.

Tier 1 screening. The school administered the Terra Nova screening measure in August to all third-grade students. The cut score used to designate

“at-risk” status is equivalent to the measure’s proficiency level. Bryanna’s math score placed her in the unsatisfactory range, therefore “at risk.”

Quarterly assessments also are given at the end of each grading period. The “at risk” status is again based on degree of mastery toward the standards that are evaluated by the assessments. Bryanna placed in the unsatisfactory and partial mastery range on quarterly assessments in October.

TIER 2

Tier 2 intervention. Bryanna is receiving small-group math problem solving instruction with the special education teacher for 30 minutes a day, four days each week. Seven other students are in this group. The curriculum includes Houghton Mifflin Math Central problem solving, Investigations, and Touch Math.

Tier 2 progress monitoring. Progress monitoring consists of teacher observation and teacher-generated prompts. Data are collected on a weekly basis. The cut score designation for inadequate response is 80 percent accuracy. The following table reports Bryanna’s quiz scores in relation to the 80 percent accuracy criterion. Quizzes consist of five problems.

Table 5.3 Math Problem Solving Quizzes 2005-2006 School Year

Quiz Date	Score	Inadequate response score
Oct. 21	0	< 80 percent
Nov. 4	40	< 80%
Nov. 18	60	< 80%
Dec. 2	60	< 80%
Dec. 16	20	< 80%
Jan. 13	60	< 80%
Jan. 27	0	< 80%

DISABILITY AND ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION FOR TIER 3 – SPECIAL EDUCATION

Bryanna was referred for a special education evaluation due to inadequate response to intervention. The evaluation employed discrepancy criteria and language severity rating scales. Table 5.4, beginning on page 5.29, lists all of the components and measures used in the comprehensive evaluation.

As a result of the evaluation, Bryanna did not qualify for special education services with an SLD/LD designation as school personnel had anticipated she would. Although she did not respond to Tier 2

interventions, she still needed to exhibit a discrepancy to be eligible with an SLD designation.

However, after looking at the scores, the team determined that her biggest skill deficits were in the area of speech-language. Her Spoken Language Quotient of 67 on the TOLD P:3 assessment was more than two standard deviations below the mean. This score qualified her for Tier 3 (special education) interventions in the area of speech-language.

The school is awaiting parental consent at an initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting to begin Tier 3 (special education) services.

Table 5.4. Comprehensive Evaluation Components and Measures for SLD Determination (Bryanna)

Component	Test/ Meeting Date	Assessment/ Procedure	Type of Data or Score	Cut Score/ Criteria	Comments
Multifaceted in Nature	At IEP meeting – 2/2/06	IEP Team Decision			IEP team determined that Bryanna’s disability is in the area of speech-language
Intellectual Ability	1-11-2006	WISC-IV	Full Scale SS = 81*	> 70	
Aptitude-Achievement Discrepancies	11-28-2005	WJ-III	SS Broad Reading = 92 Broad Math = 94 Broad Written Lang = 99	< 68 to qualify as SLD	Collaboration with classroom performance data and RTI
Intra-individual Differences					
Information or Language Processing Involvement	11-29-2005	TOLD P:3	Spoken Language Quotient = 67	1½ standard deviations below the mean	Individual Skill Deficits
Exclusionary Criteria	At IEP meeting 2/2/06	IEP Team Decision			English acquisition and instruction were not found to be lacking
Behavioral and Academic Screening	1-11-2006	BASC and Conners’	BASC teacher ratings reflected attention and learning problems in the at-risk range. All other behavioral areas presented in the average range. Adaptability and social skills were rated above average, presenting relative strengths. Conners’ teacher ratings show elevated scores for areas related to cognitive inattention. Conners’ parent ratings reflect no areas of concern; all scores fell within the average ranges. The BASC parent ratings also reflected no areas of concern.	BASC and Conners’ scores are not typically used to qualify a student as PC (SLD) unless they were in the clinically significant range or the high end of the at-risk range for areas related to attention problems that may be a component of processing difficulties.	Cognitive inattention and learning problems in the at-risk range.
Appropriate Learning Experiences	At the IEP meeting 2/2/06	IEP Team Decision	Determined to be appropriate		IEP Team determined that Bryanna has had access to appropriate learning experiences.

See pages 5.57-5.61 for descriptions and reference information for the assessments listed in this table.