

Spotlight -Tier

Campus Needs Assessment Tool Planning and Evaluating Effective Implementation of a Response to Intervention Framework for Reading (Adapted)ⁱ

DIRECTIONS

This needs assessment focuses on six areas of implementation:

1. Campus Leadership
2. Management, Planning, and Evaluation (MPE)
3. Assessment
4. Instructional Framework: General
5. Instructional Framework: Core
6. Instructional Framework: Intervention

For each item, circle the number that best describes your campus. At the end of each of the six sections, enter the average of the numbers you circled for that section. Transfer averaged scores for each category to the summary table found on page 13.

Name/Position: _____
School: _____
Date Completed: _____

Spotlight -Tier

CAMPUS LEADERSHIP

1. Establishing Campus Goals and Objectives

- 1 Our campus has not established long-range or annual goals for response to intervention (RTI) implementation.
- 2 Our campus has established annual goals and objectives. However, teachers cannot articulate them, explain how our campus is moving toward these goals, or describe how the annual goals relate to the long-term objective of improving core instruction so that it is effective for at least 80 percent of students.
- 3 Annual campus goals and objectives are clearly defined and quantifiable at each grade level, are dedicated to reading instruction and assessment grounded in scientifically based reading research (SBRR), guide instructional decisions, and are commonly understood and consistently used by teachers and administrators within and between grades to evaluate and communicate student learning and to improve practice.ⁱⁱ

2. Implementing an Effective Communication Plan

- 1 There is little communication regarding RTI implementation among personnel (principal, teachers, instructional specialists/interventionists, diagnosticians) at the campus.
- 2 A support structure allows personnel to communicate to some extent on the campus.
- 3 A communication infrastructure is in place that promotes information sharing and results in communication among all stakeholders involved with RTI implementation.

3. Hiring Highly Qualified Personnel

- 1 There are teacher vacancies in general education (including bilingual, if applicable), intervention, or special education classes.
- 2 Teaching positions are filled, but qualified interventionists are not available to provide daily intervention to students meeting entry criteria.
- 3 All teaching positions are filled, and qualified interventionists provide intervention to students meeting entry criteria.

4. Ensuring Highly Qualified Personnel

- 1 Few personnel—administrators, teachers (including bilingual, if applicable), special educators, interventionists—possess the qualifications, experiences, or certifications necessary to implement an RTI reading model.
- 2 Most personnel possess the qualifications, experience, or certifications necessary to implement an RTI reading model.
- 3 All personnel—administrators, teachers (including bilingual, if applicable), special educators, and interventionists—possess the qualifications, experience, and certification necessary to implement an RTI reading model. Effective teachers are assigned to struggling students.

5. Providing Support: RTI facilitator

- 1 An RTI facilitator has not been identified nor is staff able to describe roles and responsibilities of the RTI facilitator.
- 2 An RTI facilitator has been identified, has clearly defined roles, and meets sporadically with teachers to offer support, but does not have a presence in classrooms.
- 3 An RTI facilitator who has a strong understanding of SBRR and RTI has been identified, has clearly defined roles, and regularly meets with teachers.

Spotlight -Tier

6. Monitoring Instruction: Principal

- 1 The principal has not participated in professional development (PD) opportunities on the program/instructional framework that guides reading instruction.
- 2 The principal has participated in PD on the program/instructional framework that guides reading instruction and on how to conduct observations during core instruction. The principal has not received PD on the intervention(s). The principal sometimes participates in grade-level team meetings.
- 3 The principal has participated in PD on the program/instructional framework that guides reading instruction and on how to conduct implementation observations of the program/instructional framework. The principal has received PD on the intervention(s) and conducts observations of reading instruction and intervention. The principal often participates in grade-level team meetings. The principal can access information on student groups when observing teachers providing reading instruction and intervention.

7. Monitoring Assessment: Principal

- 1 The principal has not participated in PD on all of the assessment instruments.
- 2 The principal has participated in PD on the assessment instruments but leaves data analysis and decisions to others. The principal sometimes participates in grade-level team meetings.
- 3 The principal has participated in PD on the assessments and works with others to analyze the data. The principal participates in grade-level team meetings to analyze student reading performance data and to plan instruction.

	Total points from Campus Leadership section = Average from Campus Leadership section (divide by 7) =
--	---

Spotlight -Tier

MANAGEMENT, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION

1. **Planning for Sustainability (Long Term)**
 - 1 The campus does not have a long-term plan to sustain an RTI model. The campus does not have a plan that addresses administrator transition or turnover.
 - 2 The campus has a plan that addresses administrator transition or turnover (including PD for new administrators), but does not have a plan that specifically addresses how to sustain an RTI model or activities.
 - 3 The campus improvement plan specifically addresses sustaining RTI implementation (i.e., turnover, program continuation, and a plan for leveraging other resources).
2. **Planning for Improvement: The Campus Action Plan (Short Term)**
 - 1 There is no campus action plan supporting implementation.
 - 2 There is a campus action plan, but it is not regularly revised.
 - 3 There is a campus action plan in place to guide RTI implementation, and it is revised regularly.
3. **Using Data to Evaluate School's Implementation of Goals: Planning**
 - 1 The campus collects and tracks student assessment data but does not have a plan for using the data to determine whether RTI activities are implemented as planned; the effectiveness of these activities in achieving goals and objectives; the impact of activities on students, teachers, and other school personnel; and the extent to which the performance targets are met.
 - 2 The campus collects and tracks student assessment data but does not have a detailed, complete plan to monitor ongoing progress or use information to provide for continuous improvement.
 - 3 The campus has a solid plan for using data to determine whether RTI activities are implemented as planned; the effectiveness of the activities in achieving goals and objectives; the impact of activities on students, teachers, and other school personnel; and the extent to which the performance targets are met.
4. **Using Data to Monitor Grade-level Progress Toward Meeting Reading Performance Goals**
 - 1 The campus has not established reading performance goals, or the performance goals are not realistic.
 - 2 The campus has established grade-level performance goals but has not disaggregated grade-level data to identify need and priorities.
 - 3 The campus has used disaggregated grade-level data to determine need and priorities and has established performance goals based on these needs and priorities. Performance goals focus on closing the achievement gap for all students. Additionally, the campus can show the extent to which progress has been made (or not made) in improved reading performance of students.
5. **Using Data to Establish Intervention Entry and Exit Criteria**
 - 1 No criteria have been created for any grade level to identify when at-risk students enter or exit intervention.
 - 2 Criteria have been identified for some grade levels and may be used to identify when students enter or exit intervention.
 - 3 Clear criteria have been identified for each grade level, are based on individual student performance relative to pre-established benchmarks, and are used when entering and exiting students from intervention.

Spotlight -Tier

6. Ensuring Highly Qualified PD Providers

- 1 Our campus does not have a plan for identifying and securing PD providers who are highly knowledgeable in the area of SBRR or experienced in implementing components of research-based instruction.
- 2 Our campus has a plan for identifying and securing PD providers who are highly knowledgeable in the area of SBRR, but the plan does not provide information that links the providers' knowledge and experience to our campus' identified needs related to RTI implementation.
- 3 Our campus plan includes a process for identifying and securing PD providers who are highly knowledgeable and experienced in implementing components of scientifically based instruction. Our campus maintains and/or has access to a database of PD providers that includes qualifications, knowledge of SBRR topics and implementation, as well as evaluation results from previous presentations.

7. Coordinating an RTI Model With Other Resources and Programs

- 1 RTI activities are not coordinated with similar efforts (e.g., Accelerated Reading Instruction, Title I, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and special education).
- 2 RTI activities are somewhat coordinated with efforts that target at-risk students.
- 3 Administrators leverage all funding resources and personnel to support RTI activities and promote sustainability. By coordinating an RTI model with similar efforts, funding impact is maximized and teachers' knowledge and understanding of an RTI reading model's goals are widely disseminated. English as a second language (ESL) and special education instruction is coordinated with and complementary to general education reading instruction.

8. Using Data to Inform Budgetary Decisions

- 1 The campus does not have a systematic way of using data to identify needs or to inform budgetary decisions.
- 2 The principal annually reviews the use of assessment data to identify campus needs demonstrated by the data.
- 3 The RTI campus leadership team meets at least three times a year to analyze data from beginning, middle, and end of year student assessments; needs assessment tools; and other sources to prioritize needs related to the RTI budget.

	Total points from Management, Planning, and Evaluation section = Average from Management, Planning, and Evaluation section (divide by 8) =
--	---

ASSESSMENT

1. Selecting Instructional Assessments

- 1 Teachers on our campus use a variety of measures to assess student reading performance. A single measure is not used systematically.

Spotlight -Tier

- 2 Our campus uses research-based screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring instruments combined with other forms of information to assess student reading performance.
 - 3 Our campus systematically administers only the appropriate research-based screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring instruments, as identified in our campus plan.
2. Adhering to an Appropriate Assessment Schedule
- 1 No assessment schedule is in place.
 - 2 Individual teachers have discretion regarding when screening and diagnostic assessments are administered.
 - 3 Our campus employs a screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring assessment schedule, including an assessment “window” for each benchmark or screening period, that all teachers follow.
3. Administering Instructional Assessments With Integrity
- 1 *All* teachers, intervention staff members, and the principal have not received PD on all of the screening, diagnostic, progress-monitoring, or outcome measures used.
 - 2 All teachers, intervention staff members, and the principal have received PD on administering *some* of the assessment measures used. However, practice sessions are not provided prior to the administration of scheduled assessment measures.
 - 3 All teachers, intervention staff members, and the principal (including newly hired staff members) have received PD on administering *all* of the assessment measures used. “Refresher” practice sessions are provided prior to the administration of scheduled assessment measures.
4. Managing Instructional Assessment Data
- 1 Each teacher organizes his/her own assessment data; others do not have access to this data.
 - 2 Assistance is provided to teachers in organizing screening and progress monitoring data for all students.
 - 3 There is a campus wide system for organizing and documenting instructional assessment data, and the principal has access to all appropriate data. Assistance is provided to the teachers in organizing data as needed.
5. Using Instructional Assessment Data to Drive Core Reading Instruction
- 1 Teachers administer screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring assessments and turn in the results. Few analyze the results to form small groups or change instruction based on students’ needs.
 - 2 Most teachers use assessment data primarily to differentiate instruction and form small groups.
 - 3 All teachers can explain how they use student assessment data to form instructional groups. They adjust and differentiate instruction to meet students’ needs (including making adaptations for at-risk students during core instruction and regrouping students based on the assessment data).

Spotlight -Tier

6. Using Instructional Assessment Data to Drive Intervention Instruction

- 1 Teachers use assessment data only to decide which students will receive intervention. Progress-monitoring assessments are not administered at least every 2 weeks to all at-risk students.
- 2 Teachers use assessment data to decide which students will receive intervention. Progress-monitoring assessments are administered every 2 weeks, and student data are used to regroup students for intervention instruction.
- 3 Assessment data are used to identify intervention needs for students. Individual students have performance targets, and teachers use information from progress-monitoring assessments administered every 2 weeks to inform intervention instruction.

7. Discussing Data to Adjust Instructional Plans

- 1 Teachers/interventionists meet less than once a month to discuss student progress or plan reading instruction and intervention.
- 2 Teachers/interventionists meet once a month in grade-level meetings to plan reading instruction and intervention.
- 3 Teachers/interventionists meet regularly in grade-level meetings to discuss student progress and to plan reading instruction and intervention.

8. Using Instructional Assessment Data to Plan Professional Development

- 1 Our campus does not systematically use student assessment data to plan professional development. No campus plan specifically addresses RTI professional development.
- 2 The principal and grade-level teams meet to discuss classroom observations, student progress, and use of assessment data, but these discussions do not inform PD planning.
- 3 The principal regularly analyzes schoolwide assessment data to inform PD decisions. Grade-level teams meet regularly with the principal to analyze schoolwide assessment data and grade-level progress and to participate in PD decisions.

	Total points from Assessment section = Average from Assessment section (divide by 8) =
--	---

INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK

GENERAL

1. Describing an RTI Model

- 1 Instructional staff cannot describe the purpose of their RTI plan and implementation.
- 2 Administrators and instructional staff are implementing an RTI model but are unable to describe its major elements and how it works.
- 3 Administrators and instructional staff are implementing an RTI model and are able to describe how it works, including its impact on students' reading performance.

2. Implementing the RTI Model: Scheduling

- 1 Our campus instructional schedule does not provide an uninterrupted 90-minute block of time for core reading instruction in all classrooms.
- 2 Our campus implements a protected, uninterrupted daily minimum of 90 minutes of core reading instruction and additional time for intervention.
- 3 Our campus schedule protects an uninterrupted daily minimum of 90 minutes of core reading instruction. There is an additional 30-plus minutes of intervention instruction during the day.

3. Selecting SBRR Materials

- 1 Our campus has selected a comprehensive reading program and materials (for both English and bilingual classrooms, if applicable). However, the research basis for the materials is not known.
- 2 Our campus has selected a comprehensive reading program and materials (for both English and bilingual classrooms, if applicable) that are based on scientific reading research. We have also selected intervention materials. However, the research base for the intervention materials is not known, or the language of intervention instruction may differ from that in the core reading instruction.
- 3 Our campus has selected a comprehensive reading program and materials (for both English and bilingual classrooms, if applicable) that are based on scientific reading research. We have also selected intervention materials that align with the core program and are shown by scientific reading research to be effective with struggling readers. Intervention materials match the language of core reading materials for bilingual students.

4. Ensuring Nonlayering of Programs and Materials

- 1 Teachers, interventionists, and special education teachers are collaborating to implement the core reading program/instructional framework; however, *most* teachers also are implementing reading strategies and/or programs that have not been proven effective or whose research base is not scientific.
- 2 Teachers, interventionists, and special education teachers are implementing the core reading program/instructional framework; however, *some* teachers also are implementing reading strategies and/or programs that have not been proven effective or whose research base is not scientific.
- 3 *All* teachers, interventionists, and special education teachers are implementing the SBRR core reading program/instructional framework and intervention materials/programs. Non-SBRR materials and outdated materials or programs are not in use.

Spotlight -Tier

5. Increasing Students' Access to Print Materials

- 1 Our campus is not using funds to increase students' access to print.
- 2 Our campus is using funds to increase the number of reading materials in the school and classroom libraries.
- 3 Our campus is using funds to increase students' access to a wide variety of reading materials, both expository and narrative, on appropriate levels (including decodable texts that allow students to practice the reading skills they are learning). Books and other print materials are being added to both the school and classroom collections. Our campus provides an incentive program to promote students' practice reading text.

6. Implementing an RTI Model: Addressing All Students' Needs

- 1 Our campus RTI decisions do not specifically address students receiving the following instruction: ESL, Title I, dyslexia, special education, etc.
- 2 Our campus RTI model decisions specifically address students receiving instruction in any one or two of these special programs: ESL, Title I, dyslexia, special education, etc.
- 3 Our campus RTI Model decisions address the needs of all students, including those receiving ESL, Title I, dyslexia, special education, etc., and include scheduling, intervention entry and exit criteria, instructional and intervention program(s), duration of intervention, who delivers intervention, location that intervention is delivered, PD needed, etc. All staff members are responsible for the success of all students.

7. Implementing an RTI Model: Addressing Individual Students' Needs

- 1 Teachers determine when a student enters intervention, how intervention is provided, and when a student exits intervention.
- 2 Students receive intervention and exit as soon as progress-monitoring data indicate an upward trend.
- 3 Teachers provide intervention instruction until students have demonstrated that they have met criteria for campus guidelines. Teachers continue to closely monitor students after they have exited intervention.

	Total points from Instructional Framework: General section = Average from Instructional Framework: General section (divide by 7) =
--	---

INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK

CORE READING

Spotlight -Tier

1. Evaluating the Core Reading Materials

- 1 Our campus has not systematically analyzed the core reading program’s critical components by grade level.
- 2 Our campus has analyzed the core reading program by grade level and staff members are able to identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- 3 We address our grade-level analysis of our core reading materials in our daily reading instruction.

2. Implementing Core Reading Program/Instructional Framework With Fidelity

- 1 Teachers use some of the activities and materials provided in the selected core reading materials in addition to strategies, activities, materials, and lessons from other reading programs or approaches.
- 2 Most teachers (and special education teachers who are using the core reading materials) are using the materials and methods of instruction presented in the core reading program/instructional framework but find it challenging to follow the program’s scope and sequence of taught knowledge and skills.
- 3 All teachers (and special education teachers who are using the core reading materials) follow the program’s scope and sequence of taught knowledge and skills and use the materials and methods of instruction presented in the core reading program/instructional framework.

3. Promoting Effective Core Implementation: RTI Facilitator

- 1 The RTI facilitator has not received PD on the core reading program/instructional framework. The RTI facilitator rarely models lessons, observes, or provides feedback to teachers.
- 2 The RTI facilitator has received PD on the core reading program/instructional framework and on how to conduct observations of core reading instruction.
- 3 The RTI facilitator has received PD on observing implementation of the core reading program/instructional framework. The RTI facilitator conducts regular grade-level meetings to enhance the core program/instructional framework implementation.

4. Incorporating Flexible Grouping in Core Reading Instruction

- 1 Teachers provide all instruction in whole-group settings and do not use assessment data to differentiate instruction or to create flexible (homogeneous and heterogeneous) groups.
- 2 Teachers provide some same-ability, small-group instruction during the 90-minute core reading instruction.
- 3 Teachers provide differentiated instruction using the most appropriate grouping mechanisms (whole group, pairs, mixed-ability groups, same-ability groups).

5. Differentiated Instruction

- 1 Teachers provide the same instruction and/or use the same materials for all students during small-group instruction, centers/work stations, and/or independent practice.
- 2 Teachers match materials and instruction to student needs in small groups but use the same materials/activities for all students in centers/work stations or independent practice.
- 3 Teachers match materials and instruction to student needs in small groups. Materials/activities for all students in centers/work stations and independent practice provide scaffolded practice to match student need.

	Total points from Instructional Framework: Core Reading section = Average from Instructional Framework: Core Reading section (Divide by 5) =
--	---

INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK

INTERVENTION

Spotlight -Tier

1. Differentiating Instruction

- 1 Targeted small-group instruction is not scheduled or provided to all students who meet the campus' intervention criteria, or intervention instruction is not based on SBRR strategies, or it is not consistently provided in the language used during core reading instruction.
- 2 Small-group intervention is scheduled and provided consistently, but the instruction is not differentiated to meet students' needs, as reflected in the assessment data (i.e., one intervention or lesson fits all), or the language used in the intervention is not the same as for core instruction.
- 3 Small-group intervention is scheduled and provided consistently, and the language used is the same as for core instruction. Lessons target identified student needs. Teachers use ongoing progress-monitoring data.

2. Describing the Effectiveness of Intervention(s)

- 1 Teachers, interventionists, or designated administrator cannot identify the intervention(s).
- 2 Teachers, interventionists, or designated administrator can identify the intervention(s), strategies, and/or materials and can describe how they are implemented.
- 3 Teachers, interventionists, or designated administrator can identify the intervention program(s), describe how they are implemented, and describe their effectiveness in reducing the number of children who are at risk.

3. Linking Knowledge of Intervention to Core Reading Instruction: RTI Facilitator

- 1 The RTI facilitator has not received PD in the intervention materials.
- 2 The RTI facilitator has received PD in the intervention materials. However, the RTI facilitator cannot articulate the relationship between the intervention materials and the core program/instructional framework.
- 3 The RTI facilitator has received PD on implementing intervention. S/he knows how the intervention aligns with the core program/instructional framework and provides insight to teachers in grade-level meetings.

4. Defining Entry and Exit Criteria For Intervention

- 1 Intervention entry and exit criteria for English (and for bilingual, if applicable) instruction are not defined for any grade level.
- 2 The campus has *partially* defined entry and exit criteria for intervention (e.g., there are criteria for some grade levels, or there are criteria for English instruction but no criteria for bilingual instruction, etc.).
- 3 Intervention entry and exit criteria for English (and for bilingual, if applicable) instruction are defined for all grade levels.

Spotlight -Tier

5. Identifying Interventionists for Intervention at Each Grade Level

- 1 The interventionist(s) for English (and bilingual, if applicable) instruction are not identified.
- 2 Interventionist(s) are identified at some levels (e.g., interventionists are identified for only certain grade levels; interventionists are identified for English intervention but not for bilingual intervention).
- 3 Interventionist(s) for English (and bilingual, if applicable) instruction for all grade levels are identified.

6. Accounting for Student Mobility

- 1 The campus does not have a plan for assessing and providing intervention instruction to students who enter school after the assignment of students to intervention instruction.
- 2 The campus has a plan to assess students who enter school after the assessment period, but the campus waits until the next “round” to place students in intervention.
- 3 The campus has a plan to immediately assess students and uses its entry criteria to place all students who need intervention.

	Total points from Instructional Framework: Intervention section = Average from Instructional Framework: Intervention section (divide by 6) =
--	---

Spotlight -Tier

Individual Summary of Scores

Directions: Transfer your averaged scores for each category to the following table.

Name/Position: _____

School: _____

Date Completed: _____

Element	Average Score
I. Campus Leadership	
II. Management, Planning, and Evaluation (MPE)	
III. Assessment	
IV. Instructional Framework: General	
V. Instructional Framework: Core Reading	
VI. Instructional Framework: Intervention	

Spotlight -Tier

Summary of Schoolwide Scores

Directions: After individuals have completed their assessments independently, enter their scores in the table. To compute the average, add each column and divide by the number of participants.

Name, grade level, role	Leadership I	MPE III	Assessment III	General IV	Core V	Intervention VI
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
Total						
Average						

Spotlight -Tier

Prioritizing Areas to Improve and Determining Action Steps

Directions: Determine specific ways to strengthen weak elements. Identify three areas on which to focus initially. Determine action steps to target each focus area. Decide who is responsible, and set target date for completion.

Focus Area	Action Steps	Who and When

ⁱ Adapted from Vaughn Gross Center for Reading and Language Arts at The University of Texas at Austin. (2006). *Reading First campus needs assessment tool* (Revised). Austin, TX: Author.

ⁱⁱ Adapted from Kame'enui, E., & Simmons, D. (2000). *Planning and evaluation tool for effective schoolwide reading programs*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement.