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Making Informed Instructional Adjustments in RTI Models: Essentials for Practitioners
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Abstract

School-based response to intervention (RTI) teams must gather, organize, chart, and interpret essential instructional information to make effective adjustments to meet the academic needs of struggling learners. Quantified data such as student proficiency scores, rate of progress trends, and achievement gap results provide the foundation for making multitiered decisions in RTI models. In addition to these quantified results, several key qualitative instructional aspects exist in every teaching and learning environment that warrant consideration when making instructional decisions. This article describes key quantitative and qualitative instructional essentials necessary to make informed academic adjustments for struggling learners. Identification of the essentials discussed is based on literature review and fieldwork completed with school-based RTI problem-solving teams in their efforts to implement RTI.
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A key foundational element within response to intervention (RTI) models is the use of achievement data as the basis for making instructional decisions to initiate teaching and learning adjustments. Low achievement data scores for struggling learners indicate that some instructional adjustments are warranted. However, future academic progress depends significantly on adjusting the proper classroom and instructional element(s). To make the most informed decision once universal screening or progress-monitoring scores indicate a struggling learner, a variety of classroom aspects require
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consideration prior to launching selected adjustments. Collectively, knowledge of quantified and qualitative instructional aspects provide school-based RTI teams with crucial information necessary to make effective instructional adjustments. As practitioners make important learner decisions, it is critical to keep in mind that low achievement data or rate of progress primarily indicate that some change is needed, not the specific instructional element(s) requiring necessary change. Within RTI models at many schools, this type of decision making occurs relative to three tiers of instruction (D. Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Hoover, Baca, Wexler-Love, & Saenz, 2008; Vaughn, 2003).

**Tier 1**
The first tier of instruction is the core instruction provided to all students in which, at minimum, 80% of all learners in the classroom are successfully achieving grade-level benchmarks (Yell, 2004). Should less than 80% of students in the classroom or grade fail to achieve at or above benchmark, then the first course of action is to adjust, differentiate, or otherwise change the core instruction to better meet the instructional and behavioral needs of most learners in the teaching and learning environment (Hoover, 2011). Tier 1 instruction is characterized by several instructional components considered essential to effective learning: (a) research-based curriculum, (b) evidence-based interventions, (c) differentiated strategies, and (d) sufficient opportunities to learn (i.e., 80% or more achieve at benchmark). Collectively, these four instructional components represent high-quality instruction and evidence-based practice, which are discussed in greater detail below. High-quality Tier 1 instruction provides all students, at minimum, these four aspects in the teaching and learning environment.

**Tier 2**
The second tier of instruction within an RTI model is supplemental instruction provided to those learners who are at-risk, struggling, or otherwise not achieving at grade-level benchmarks (Bender & Shores, 2007). Key to understanding Tier 2 instruction is the fact that this instruction must supplement, not replace Tier 1 instruction—that is, all students provided Tier 2 supplemental instruction must also be provided all Tier 1 instruction. Removing a learner from Tier 1 core instruction to provide Tier 2 instruction is an inappropriate use of Tier 2 instruction because the learner is missing new instruction provided in Tier 1. Expectations are that 15% to 20% of learners require some form of Tier 2 instruction during their schooling (Yell, 2004). Tier 2 instruction is characterized by additional educational supports provided in small groups (e.g., four to six students), which reflect increased duration and intensity over that provided in Tier 1. Students are provided Tier 2 instruction by various educators (e.g., general class teacher, special educator, instructional interventionist) within both push-in and pull-out settings, with push-in being the preferred structure.

**Tier 3**
The third tier of instruction in RTI models includes use of intensive interventions to meet the most significant needs of struggling learners, including those with disabilities. More specifically, Tier 3 represents special education as suggested by Mellard and Johnson (2008), although in some models Tier 3 reflects intensive interventions implemented prior to special education, in which case a fourth tier represents special education (Klingner & Edwards, 2006). Whatever structure Tier 3 assumes, it represents intensive interventions provided to an estimated 1% to 5% of learners (Yell, 2004). Tiers 1 and 2 instruction are characterized by core curriculum supplemented as necessary, meeting the needs of approximately 95% of learners. Tier 3 is characterized by the highly frequent implementation of intensive interventions delivered in greater duration than possible in Tiers 1 and 2 to meet the needs of approximately 5% of learners (Bender & Shores, 2007; Mellard & Johnson, 2008). This may include use of an alternate curriculum and/or individualized instructional interventions delivered in settings that contain very small numbers of learners (i.e., one to three students).

**Instructional Elements in RTI Decision Making**
Consideration of classroom factors associated with data scores is consistent with and a key component of the problem-solving model when making instructional decisions for struggling learners within RTI (D. Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Marston, Lau, & Muyskens, 2007). That is, both quantitative data scores along with qualitative supporting information are used collectively to make multitiered instructional decisions as illustrated in Table 1.

As shown, several quantitative and qualitative factors are included in the decision-making process as RTI school teams consider the multitiereed needs of learners who struggle in school. Each of these is discussed in the subsequent section highlighting importance of RTI decision making to meet a variety of learner needs. This article guides practitioners in making the most informed decisions possible using both quantitative and qualitative data and results, decisions that generally fall within one of four categories.

**Category 1**: Tier 1 instructional implementation is enhanced to better comply with fidelity demands (Tier 2 instruction is not recommended due to lack of corroboration of Tier 1 instructional fidelity).

**Category 2**: Tier 1 instruction is continued with additional differentiations and with more closely
monitoring of student progress; Tier 1 fidelity is confirmed.

Category 3: Tier 2 supplemental instruction is recommended; Tier 1 fidelity is confirmed.

Category 4: Tier 3 intensive intervention is recommended; Tiers 1 and 2 instructional fidelity is confirmed, but yields insufficient academic progress and results.

Based on research and work with school practitioners responsible for making RTI data-based decisions for struggling learners, several classroom elements associated with the achievement data scores were determined as needing consideration to make the most informed and accurate decisions. Use of both quantitative and qualitative instructional elements provides RTI school teams with essential information about the struggling learner, as discussed below.

Quantitative Decision-Making Elements: Achievement Data Scores

As discussed, quantitative data scores serve as the foundation for RTI multitiered decision making. This includes the data aspects associated with proficiency cut scores and level, gap analysis, and rate of progress. Knowledge about each of these quantitative elements is essential to the problem-solving decision making process for struggling learners.

Proficiency cut score/level. A cut score is a score established by the school or district above which is considered an acceptable level of performance for that grade. Cut scores range from the lowest 25% of the class or grade down to the lowest 10% (Bender & Shores, 2007). Student scores that fall below the established cut score are considered at-risk (Mellard & Johnson, 2008), and depending on how far below, the learner may be considered a struggling learner requiring more intensive instructional adjustments (i.e., Tier 2 or 3). Cut scores serve as the minimum proficiency level above which all learners are expected to achieve, assuming the Tier 1 core research-based curriculum is appropriate for the students and implemented with fidelity. A learner’s actual proficiency level is compared to the proficiency cut score.

Gap analysis. In addition to determining the learner’s cut score, the analysis of progress towards curricular benchmarks within RTI models includes determining the size of the gap that exists between expected and actual performance relative to grade-level peers. Students who are achieving below expected levels of performance experience a gap between where they are performing and where they should be relative to curriculum achievement benchmarks (i.e., reading fluency levels, reading comprehension, mathematics computational fluency). The size of the gap provides another piece of quantitative data to use in making informed curricular decisions. Students who indicate a gap of two or more levels are demonstrating signs of being significantly below their grade-level peers. Therefore, a gap of two or more is considered significant and requires immediate multitiered supplemental or intensive supports (Colorado Department of Education, 2008). This is further highlighted by the gains needed to catch up to grade-level peers. For example, a gap of two requires the student to engage in and maintain a very aggressive program reflecting a rate of progress that is far greater than what is typically manageable in the Tier 1 curriculum implementation process, thereby demonstrating the need for Tier 2 supplemental supports (Hoover, 2009). The expected educational time frame necessary for struggling learners to satisfactorily close the gap leads to the third interrelated aspect necessary to consider when identifying curricular needs (i.e., rate of progress).

Rate of progress. A key consideration when evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of curriculum within multitiered RTI models is determining the learner’s rate of progress towards benchmarks relative to grade-level peers (Knotek, 2007). A student who is achieving below the cut score may also demonstrate progress commensurate with or higher-than-grade-level peers, indicating that given sufficient time and supports there is a high probability that the learner will catch up to peers. This is significant within the overall RTI process because failure to achieve at levels and to progress at a rate consistent with those of peers, may eventually lead to a special education referral for a learning disability (Kovaleski, 2003). These two aspects are referred to as dual discrepancy (L. S. Fuchs, 2003; D. Fuchs & Fuchs, 1998), in
which a discrepancy between expected and actual achievement and rate of progress needs to be determined.

**Qualitative Decision-Making Elements:**

*Practice, Differentiation, Instructional Type*

The qualitative elements associated with making informed instructional adjustments grounded in screening or monitoring quantified data include confirming use of: (a) evidence-based practice, (b) classroom and instructional differentiations, and (c) key instructional types to facilitate sufficient opportunities to learn. Whereas instructional data confirm a struggling learner’s content area of need, actual classroom practice provides insight into accurate interpretation of those data as discussed below.

**Evidence-Based Practice.** Fundamental to RTI models is the implementation of evidence-based practice to provide high-quality instruction to meet the needs of all learners. More specifically, RTI is grounded in the implementation of research-validated instruction (i.e., evidence-based practice) (Haager, Klingner, & Vaughn, 2007; Moran & Malott, 2004). Evidence-based practice therefore includes all aspects within the teaching and learning environment that have been validated through research. To facilitate practitioners’ understanding and application of evidence-based practice, it is framed to include the two specific components of instruction necessary to provide all students sufficient opportunities to learn: (a) research-based curriculum; and (b) evidence-based interventions.

**Research-based curriculum (RBC).** RBC refers to comprehensive curricula that include materials, processes, enrichment activities, and related components designed to provide a complete program of study in the targeted content area. Examples of RBC include comprehensive programs such as *Investigations, Success for All, Saxon Math, Ladders to Literacy, Literacy by Design, Lindamood-Bell,* or *Wilson Reading System* to name a few. These similar RBCs may be used in one or more tiers of instruction provided they serve as comprehensive programs to deliver instruction.

**Evidence-based interventions (EBI).** EBI are those methods that contain specific steps, processes, or parameters designed to provide the learner with a structured intervention to meet a defined need area (e.g., explicit teaching, reading comprehension, paired learning, math computation, self-monitoring). Examples of EBI include clearly defined, researched, and validated methods such as direct instruction, classwide peer tutoring, collaborative strategic reading, peer-assisted learning strategies (PALS), self-monitoring, or reciprocal teaching, to name a few. These and similar EBI may be used in any tier of instruction. When used in conjunction with RBCs, they provide effective interventions for Tier 2 supplemental instruction.

Distinguishing between RBC and EBI to meet the needs of all learners is one way to more easily assist practitioners to put into practice evidence-based education, especially if instructional adjustments are necessary due to lack of progress toward benchmarks. “This breakdown allows teachers to view classroom instructional needs within a response to intervention model from both an overall and specific instructional perspective” (Hoover & Love, 2011). For example, in some classrooms the overall Tier 1 comprehensive RBC may require adjustment or change due to the fact that less than 80% of students are making adequate progress. In other teaching and learning situations, use of one specific EBI (e.g., reciprocal teaching) may be necessary to provide needed Tier 1 differentiation and/or Tier 2 supplemental instruction to provide more appropriate and sufficient opportunities to learn.

**Instructional fidelity.** In addition to confirming the use of RBC and EBI, educators must make certain that these are implemented in the manner in which they have been researched and validated, otherwise referred to as implementation with fidelity. That is, classroom teachers implementing the curricula and interventions the way they are supposed to be implemented? If not, the first course of action is to ensure that this occurs for all learners so a minimum of 80% of students achieve satisfactorily. Deviating significantly from established procedures negatively affects the integrity of curricula and assessment implementation, which in turn affects the validity of the screening or progress monitoring results. Therefore, educators teaching in RTI models must make certain that all instruction and associated assessments are properly implemented and that evidence exists to confirm their proper implementation (e.g., direct observations, interviews, videotaped lessons).

**Classroom and Instructional Differentiations.** Effective education in any tier of instruction, particularly Tier 1 instruction, involves use of many different individual strategies that collectively reflect a differentiated classroom (Heacox, 2002; Tomlinson, 1999, 2001). These differentiated strategies include various teacher or student strategies such as planned ignoring, proximity control, word walls, student groupings, appropriate wait time for student response, touch control, self-management, rewards/reinforcers, repeating directions, or posting classroom expectations, to name a few. Use of differentiations is essential to the proper implementation high-quality instruction found in any tier of instruction. Based on discussions of differentiated classrooms (Heacox, 2002; Hoover, 2011, n.d.; Tomlinson, 1999, 2001), at minimum four curricular elements capture the core aspects associated with differentiated learning. Consideration of these better informs practitioners on problem-solving teams about the needs of struggling learners.

**Curriculum Element 1—Content/skills.** Element 1 includes the knowledge, skills, ways of thinking, and outcomes found within mandated state or district curricula. This includes the research-based curricula used in RTI, such as *Investigations, Literacy by Design, or Wilson Foundations.* Instructional aspects associated with Curriculum Element 1 include...
determining the extent to which the learner possesses a variety of content-related skills sufficient to properly access the Tier 1 curricula. These include

1. Current reading level
2. Experiential background in content area
3. Required prerequisites needed to access specific content topics being studied
4. Language proficiency level in language of instruction
5. Motivation to learn content being taught
6. Higher level thinking abilities

**Curriculum Element 2—Evidence-based interventions.** The second element includes teaching interventions grounded in research and validated for defined purposes such as direct instruction, collaborative strategic reading, class-wide peer tutoring, or reciprocal teaching. Instructional aspects associated with Curriculum Element 2 include determining the extent to which the selected evidence-based intervention does the following:

1. Facilitates active student participation
2. Assists learner to remain on task
3. Is clearly understood by the learner
4. Is compatible with the student’s preferences toward learning
5. Actively engages the learner in the curriculum
6. Facilitates completion of assigned task
7. Facilitates acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of content knowledge/skills

**Curriculum Element 3—Instructional setting.** The different work structures for implementing research-based curricula and evidence-based interventions are included in Element 3 (e.g., cooperative groups, whole-class instruction, independent learning center work, paired tasks). Instructional aspects associated with Curriculum Element 3 include determining the effect that the selected instructional arrangement has on the learner. These include

1. Attention to task
2. Completion of task
3. Active engagement with the task
4. Increased and maintained participation
5. Self-management of behavior
6. Acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of content knowledge/skills

**Curriculum Element 4—Class/instructional management.** Element 4 includes the various classroom and instructional management procedures, strategies, and structures established to manage learning and behavior in each tier of instruction. Instructional aspects associated with Curriculum Element 4 include determining the extent to which the class and instructional managements facilitate the following:

1. Effective uses of various instructional arrangements (i.e., Curriculum Element 3)
2. Appropriate structures, movement, and time on task
3. Differentiations to meet diverse academic and social/behavioral needs
4. A positive physical and emotional learning environment
5. Use of relevant and meaningful rewards and reinforcements
6. Consistent implementation of classroom expectations, rules, and routines
7. Effective uses of academic learning time
8. Efficient teacher and student time management
9. Students’ responsibility for their own learning
10. Sufficient opportunities to learn
11. Acquisition, maintenance, and generalization of content knowledge and skills

The preceding instructional examples associated with each of the four curriculum elements are not all-inclusive and are presented to illustrate the types of curricular items for consideration to make informed instructional decisions for struggling learners. Gathering information relative to each of these four elements occurs through a variety of practices including data assessment and collection (e.g., AIMSweb), observations, work samples, performance-based products, or interviews, to name a few. School-based RTI problem-solving teams should consider each of the four curricular elements prior to deciding on the proper instructional adjustment in efforts to avoid unnecessary changes (e.g., changing the evidence-based intervention when the classroom management requires modifications; changing to a different direct instruction intervention when movement to a cooperative learning strategy is warranted). All four of these curricular elements operate in the classroom in simultaneous ways; consideration of each element individually and as an integrated whole is essential to making informed instructional adjustments.

**Key Instructional Types to Facilitate Sufficient Opportunities to Learn.** Educational practices take on a variety of shapes, forms, and areas of emphasis. However, interventions and strategies will generally fall within one or more of the following three instructional learning types.

**Instructional Type 1—Direct.** Direct instruction is a time-tested methodology that includes curricula and teaching interventions that rely primarily on direct teacher approaches that facilitate broad generalization of knowledge and skills (Engelmann & Carnine, 1982; Moran & Malott, 2004), and supports instructional adjustments in any tier within RTI.

**Instructional Type 2—Cooperative.** Teaching and learning grounded in student-driven efforts falls within cooperative practices. Unlike direct instruction, cooperative instruction
relies on student-directed and peer-mediated learning where students work together and assume responsibility and accountability for making decisions within a cooperative, small-group, or paired structure (Kagan & Kagan, 2009).

**Instructional Type 3—Independent.** Educational instruction or practice based primarily on the learner completing tasks individually for purposes of self-teaching, self-practice, enrichment, or evaluation refers to independent learning (Moran & Malott, 2004; Sabornie & deBettencourt, 2009).

Table 2 provides examples of evidence-based reading practices and programs categorized by instructional type. The table, developed from several sources, including Bursuck and Damer (2007); Hoover (n.d.); Hoover, Klingner, Baca, and Patton (2008); and Thousand, Villa, and Nevin (2007), provides select interventions or curricula and is not all-inclusive. The table is designed to provide examples for practitioners as to how to select instructional adjustments relative to the instructional type most likely to succeed with particular struggling learners.

Using these three instructional types when classifying educational curricula or interventions provides teachers with a frame of reference when considering instructional adjustments. Also, although each intervention or general teaching strategy can be classified as being primarily based in direct, cooperative, or independent instruction, some may include more than one instructional type. Consider the following situation: Although the Tier 1 curriculum may be highly teacher-directed (i.e., direct instruction–based), it might also include elements of cooperative learning and/or independent work. However, given the primary emphasis on direct instruction, a student who struggles with direct instruction methodology may need an instructional adjustment that is primarily based in a cooperative methodology. For example, providing additional or a different direct instruction approach to some students who already struggle with direct instruction may not lead to desired performance outcomes; progress may be better achieved through a cooperative, peer-mediated method. Therefore, consideration of instructional type facilitates more informed decision making by initially determining if the struggling student should be provided a direct-, cooperative-, or independent-based approach as instructional adjustments are made in Tiers 1, 2, or 3 instruction.

### Blending Quantitative and Qualitative Data in Instructional Decision Making

The gathering, charting, summarizing, and analyzing of both quantitative and qualitative data provide RTI problem-solving team practitioners with a wealth of information necessary to make informed instructional decisions for struggling learners. Figure 1 provides a guide for use by practitioners to ensure that key essential quantitative and qualitative information is acquired and considered in the decision-making process. The figure illustrates an example for potential Tier 2 instruction for a struggling learner and may easily be adapted to other instructional tiers.

As shown, the guide provides a framework for documenting the collection of key classroom and instructional information for use in making instructional decisions. As school RTI teams gather and properly apply student achievement progress data/information (such as the content recorded from Figure 1), the challenge becomes one of knowing which of the four curricular element(s) within the instruction to adjust. For example, based on the quantitative and qualitative data and information,

### Table 2. Selected Reading Interventions and Curricula Classified by Instructional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Primary type</th>
<th>Instructional emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read Naturally</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Improves oral reading fluency and phonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Well</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Facilitates decoding and fluency development in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Teaching</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Develops reading comprehension abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwide Peer Tutoring (CWPT)</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Peer-mediated method for improving fluency and comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience Approach</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Emergent reading method for teaching process of reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Response Journals</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Facilitates greater understanding of the role of the reader in reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Response Groups</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Develops personalized reading comprehension skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE Procedure</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Facilitates reading comprehension through use of context clues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Questioning</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Facilitates increased comprehension through questioning and note-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Phonemic awareness training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers’ Theatre</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Facilitates reading comprehension and interpretation by acting out reading material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Mastery</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Highly structured comprehensive reading program for students in elementary grades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instruction:** Check each item once it is gathered for a struggling learner in the academic content area of need.

**Content Area of Need (Check):** ___ Reading ___ Math ___ Writing ___ Other:

**Proficiency Cut Score in Area of Need:**

---

**Quantitative Aspects (Student Data)**

**Proficiency Score (Provide Score):_____**

___ At or Above Cut Score ___ Below Cut Score

**Gap Analysis:**

___ Gap is less than 1 ___ Gap is between 1 and 2 ___ Gap is 2 or greater

**Rate of Progress (Provide expected rate of progress):_____**

___ Rate is similar to age/grade level peers ___ Rate is below age/grade level peers

---

**Qualitative Aspects (Instructional Information)**

___ Tier 1 Research-based curriculum is confirmed prior to proceeding with Tier 2 decision-making

___ Tier 1 Evidence-based interventions are confirmed prior to proceeding with Tier 2 decision-making

___ Tier 1 Instructional fidelity is confirmed prior to proceeding with Tier 2 decision-making

___ Tier 1 Differentiations (i.e., content, interventions, setting, management) confirmed prior to proceeding with Tier 2 decision-making

___ Sufficient opportunities to learn within instructional type (i.e., direct, cooperative, independent) confirmed prior to proceeding with Tier 2 decision making

---

**Additional Data Gathering Needs**

Based on the above checked items list those areas that require additional data gathering:

___ 1:

___ 2:

___ 3:

*Check each item to indicate that collection of these additional items has been completed.*

---

**Figure 1.** RTI quantitative and qualitative decision-making guide

---

1. Does the instructional intervention require a change?
2. Does the teacher need to make significant adjustments in how the classroom management is implemented prior to implementing Tier 2 instruction?
3. Can the learner’s progress be improved by changing from a teacher-directed instructional environment to more extensive use of cooperative learning?
4. What are the effects of the classroom grouping of students (e.g., small, large groupings) on student progress?
5. Is the Tier 1 instruction culturally responsive for struggling diverse learners?
6. Does the Tier 1 instruction allow approximately 80% of learners to achieve satisfactorily?

When considering these and related instructional questions, practitioners who serve on school RTI problem-solving teams should keep in mind that achievement data primarily indicate to what extent the overall instruction is successful in helping learners make adequate progress.

However, these same data do not specifically tell educators what needs to be changed or adjusted in the classroom, only that something requires adjustment should the learner not make adequate progress. Consideration of the various quantitative and qualitative instructional elements provides insight as to which curricular area(s) requires adjustment.

---

**Conclusion**

Practitioners who consider the quantitative and qualitative classroom and instructional aspects of teaching and learning when addressing the needs of struggling learners increase the possibility of adjusting the correct area, thereby reducing the practice of hoping that correct instructional adjustments have been made. In summary, practitioner attention to the following items, as discussed in this article, increases the proper selection and implementation of multiterritory instructional adjustments grounded in achievement screening or monitoring data:
1. Proficiency level is documented.
2. Gap analysis between expected and actual academic performance is determined.
3. Actual rate of progress is compared to expected rate of progress based on age/grade-level peers.
4. Differentiation needs associated with content, intervention, setting, and management are determined and implemented prior to and/or as part of making instructional adjustments.
5. Instructional type (i.e., direct, cooperative, independent) to best meet learner need is identified and implemented to generate effective progress in multitiered instruction.
6. Tier 1 instructional fidelity is confirmed through a variety of methods (e.g., observations, coteaching, work samples, videorecording) prior to implementing Tier 2 supports.
7. Screening and monitoring devices measure progress towards benchmarks directly addressed in the curriculum.

When used by the RTI school problem-solving teams, quantitative and supporting qualitative data and information facilitate effective multitiered instructional decisions for struggling learners. Adherence to these instructional aspects will guide practitioners to make more informed instructional adjustments in Tiers 1, 2, or 3 as RTI models are implemented to meet a variety of content area needs.
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