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Today’s Presentation

- What is Intensive Intervention?
- The National Center on Intensive Intervention’s (NCII) approach
- Rationale for the Tools Charts
- Review process
- Using the Tools Chart
Intensive intervention* is designed to address severe and persistent learning or behavior difficulties. Intensive interventions should be:

- Driven by data
- Characterized by increased intensity (e.g., smaller group, expanded time) and individualization of academic instruction and/or behavioral supports.

*May also be known as Tier 3 or tertiary intervention
NCII’s Approach to Intensive Intervention: Data-Based Individualization (DBI)

Data-Based Individualization (DBI) is a systematic method for using data to determine when and how to provide more intensive intervention.

- Its origins lie in data-based program modification/experimental teaching, which was first developed at the University of Minnesota (Deno & Mirkin, 1977) and then expanded upon by others (Fuchs, Deno, & Mirkin, 1984; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Hamlett, 1989b; Capizzi & Fuchs, 2005).

- DBI is a process, not a single intervention program or strategy.

- It is not a one-time fix—it is an ongoing process composed of intervention and assessment adjusted over time.
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How Do Tools Charts Help Me Plan for Intensive Intervention?
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What Are Secondary Interventions?

- Standardized, evidence-based interventions designed for at-risk students.
  - Often referred to as…
    - Tier 2 intervention
    - Remedial curriculum
  - Common examples
    - Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)
    - Wilson Just Words
    - Check-in/Check-out
    - Corrective Math
## Distinction Between Secondary and Intensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary (T2)</th>
<th>Intensive (T3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td>Follow standardized evidence-based programs as designed</td>
<td>Use a standardized evidence-based program as a platform, but adapt instruction based on student data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DURATION AND TIMEFRAME</strong></td>
<td>Use duration and timeframe defined by developer</td>
<td>Intensify frequency and/or duration to meet student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP SIZE</strong></td>
<td>3-7 students (as defined by developer)</td>
<td>No more than 3 students (elementary level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONITOR PROGRESS</strong></td>
<td>At least once per month</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION SERVED</strong></td>
<td>At risk</td>
<td>Significant and persistent learning and behavior needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence and Relevance

Secondary intervention programs should be:

- **Evidence-based**
- **Relevant** to your needs
- **Feasible** to implement

NCII’s tools charts are intended to help consumers evaluate intervention programs along these dimensions.
# Academic Interventions Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Fidelity of Implementation</th>
<th>Measures Targeted</th>
<th>Measures Broader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Any -</td>
<td>- Any -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Quality**

**Effect Size**

**Intensity**

**Additional Research**

**Title**
- **Academy of MATH**
  - Torlaković (2011)
- **Academy of READING**
  - Fiedorowicz & Trites (1987)
  - Torlaković (2011)
- **Early Vocabulary Connections**
  - Nelson, Vadas, & Sanders (2011)
- **Failure Free Reading**
  - Torgesen, Myers, Schirm, Stuart, Vartivarian, et al. (2006)
- **Fast Forward Language Series**
  - Slattery (2003)
Developing the Charts
Technical Review Committees

- Started with National Centers on Student Progress Monitoring and Response to Intervention
- Reviews are conducted by members of the NCII’s Technical Review Committees (TRCs) on progress monitoring and intervention
- Members are national experts in measurement, research methodology, and the content area
- Visit [http://www.intensiveintervention.org/about-us/centers-technical-review-committees](http://www.intensiveintervention.org/about-us/centers-technical-review-committees) to learn more about TRC members
Tool Review Process

- Step 1: Submission from vendor
- Step 2: First-level review
- Step 3: Second-level review
- Step 4: Interim communication with vendors
- Step 5: Third-level review
- Step 6: Publication of results
Tool Review Process

- NCII does not endorse or recommend products.
- Charts are available to assist educators and families in becoming informed consumers who can select a program that meets their needs.
- The charts do not represent an exhaustive list of programs.
- Vendors voluntarily submit to NCII for review.
Using the Tools Charts
Tips for Using the Tools Chart

1. Gather a team
2. Determine your needs
3. Determine your priorities
4. Familiarize yourself with the content and language of the chart
5. Review the data
6. Get more information
Step 1: Gather a Team

- Who should be involved in selecting a secondary intervention program?
- What types of expertise and what perspectives should be involved in selecting an intervention program?
Step 2: Determine Your Needs

- For what skills do I need an intervention program?
- For what grades do I need an intervention program?
- Will this tool/program be used with all students or only a specific subgroup(s) of students? Which subgroup(s)?
Step 3: Determine Your Priorities

Is it an intervention program that…

- can be purchased for a reasonable cost?
- does not take long to administer?
- offers ready access to training and technical support for staff?
- meets the highest standards for technical rigor?
Step 4: Familiarize Yourself With the Content and Language of the Chart

1. Ratings of technical rigor:

   - Convincing evidence
   - Partially convincing evidence
   - Unconvincing evidence
   - Data unavailable

2. Implementation requirements for the program

3. Detailed data submitted by the vendor
4. Familiarize Yourself With the Content and Language of the Chart

**Implementation requirements:**
1. Descriptive information
2. Usage information
3. Acquisition and cost
4. Program specification and requirements
5. Training

Click the name of the program to view its implementation table.
4. Familiarize Yourself With the Content and Language of the Chart

Select Elementary or Secondary School to select the grade level of interest

Select Reading or Math to limit the tools to the subject of interest
## Intervention Tools Chart: Content and Language

**Technical rigor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Fidelity of Implementation</th>
<th>Measures Targeted</th>
<th>Measures Broader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of MATH</td>
<td>Torlaković (2011)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td>Fiedorowicz &amp; Trites (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td>Torlaković (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Vocabulary</td>
<td>Nelson, Vadasy, &amp; Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Technical rigor:**
- Participants
- Design
- Fidelity of implementation
- Measures—targeted
- Measures—broader
Study Quality: Participants

This tools chart presents information about studies that have been conducted and includes ratings from our IRC members on the technical rigor of the studies. The third tab, Intensity, provides information related to the intensity of the interventions. The fourth tab, Additional Research, provides information about other studies and research.

Additional information is provided below the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of MATH Torlaković (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of READING Fedorowicz &amp; Trites (1987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of READING Torlaković (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Vocabulary Connections Nelson, Vadasy, &amp; others (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size: 51 students (26 program, 25 control)

Risk Status: Students in grade 2 who scored in the bottom 30th percentile on the STAR Math Assessment were identified as at risk for academic failure. Students in grades 3 and 4 who were categorized as ‘Basic’ or ‘Below Basic’ in overall mathematics proficiency on the DIBELS were identified as at risk for academic failure.

Demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>p of chi square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Quality: Design

Design:

Did the study use random assignment? Yes.

If not, was it a tenable quasi-experiment? Not applicable.

If the study used random assignment, at pretreatment, were the program and control groups not statistically significantly different and had a mean standardized difference that fell within 0.25 SD on measures used as covariates or on pretest measures also used as outcomes? Yes.

If not, at pretreatment, were the program and control groups not statistically significantly different and had a mean standardised difference that fell within 0.25 SD on measures central to the study (i.e., pretest measures also used as outcomes), and outcomes were analyzed to adjust for pretreatment differences? Not applicable.

Were the program and control groups demographically comparable at pretreatment? Yes.

Was there attrition bias? No.

Did the unit of analysis match the unit for random assignment (for randomized studies) or the assignment strategy (for quasi-experiments)? Yes.

---

1 WWC follows guidance from the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) in determining attrition bias. The WWC model for determining bias based on a combination of differential and overall attrition rates can be found on page 13-14 of this document: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_procedures_v3_1_standards_handbook.pdf
Study Quality: Fidelity of Implementation

Fidelity of Implementation:

Describe when and how fidelity of treatment information was obtained: The Academy of MATH automatically collects and stores information concerning the amount of time students spend in the program, time spent training, percentage of the program components completed, and skills mastered. Study facilitators also collected qualitative reports from teachers on-site to ensure treatment fidelity.

Provide documentation (i.e., in terms of numbers) of fidelity of treatment implementation: Teachers received implementation training before the beginning of the study that asked them to use the program for a minimum of 30 minutes three to five times a week.

In Academy of MATH instructional benchmarks are identified by the Placement Test that is built into the program and presented to students at their first login. The Placement test evaluates students’ various math skills. Based on the Placement test score, the number of lessons needed for each skill to close the gap to allow a student to reach their grade level are identified. In order to complete a lesson, a learner needs to have a score of at least 85-95% correct for that lesson, depending on the skill that is being taught. The way that lesson is mapped into sessions is that every time a student logs into the program, he will continue with the lesson that he was last working on with the following lesson if the previous lesson was completed with 85% (or higher) accuracy.

Number of lessons for each student is identified by his performance on the Placement test. In other words, the number of lessons for a skill area depends on students’ proficiency. Percentage of program completed is a variable automatically stored in an online database that represents percentage of assigned lessons completed by each student. In one semester (or one school year) a less proficient student with the same number of lessons completed, the same time in program and time on task will have much smaller percentage of completed lessons than a more proficient student since the amount of work he needs to do in order to close the gap and be at his grade level.
Study Quality: Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Measure</th>
<th>Score type &amp; range of measure</th>
<th>Reliability statistics</th>
<th>Relevance to program instructional content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of MATH Placement Test</td>
<td>Grade Level Equivalent (GLE), 0-12</td>
<td>Test-Retest Coefficient = 0.35</td>
<td>Directly tests content trained in the Academy of MATH® with different questions than those used during training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broader Measure</th>
<th>Score type &amp; range of measure</th>
<th>Reliability statistics</th>
<th>Relevance to program instructional content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Online Math Assessment Numbers and Operations (DOMA)</td>
<td>GLE, 0-12</td>
<td>Test-Retest Coefficient = 0.85</td>
<td>Incorporated novel problems in areas students trained in Academy of MATH® but in novel format and structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Online Math Assessment Measurement (DOMA)</td>
<td>GLE, 0-12</td>
<td>Test-Retest Coefficient = 0.78</td>
<td>Incorporated novel problems in areas students trained in Academy of MATH® but in novel format and structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a table showing the targeted and broader measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures Targeted</th>
<th>Measures Broader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of MATH Placement Test</td>
<td>Academy of MATH Placement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Vocabulary Connections</td>
<td>Early Vocabulary Connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Number of outcome measures
- Mean effect size—targeted
- Mean effect size—broader
- Disaggregated data for demographic subgroups
- Disaggregated data for <20th percentile
Effect Size

- Effect size represents the size of the relationship between two variables

- Cohen (1988):
  - .8 or higher is “large”
  - .5 is “moderate”
  - .2 to .3 is “small”

- WWC:
  - .25 is “substantively important”
Effect Size

Number of Outcome Measures: 14 Reading

Mean ES - Targeted: 0.08
Mean ES - Broader: -0.03

Effect Size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3rd grade Word Identification</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3rd grade TOWRE SITE</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3rd grade AMPSwab</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3rd grade Passage Comprehension</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>3rd grade GRADE</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5th grade Word Identification</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5th grade TOWRE SITE</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5th grade AMPSwab</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Study Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of MATH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure Free Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Quality:

- Academy of MATH: Torlaković (2011)
- Academy of READING: Fiedorowicz & (1987)
- Early Vocabulary Connections: Nelson, Vadasy, & Sanders (2011)
- Failure Free Reading: Torgesen, Myers, Schirm, Stuart, Vartivarian, et al. (2006)
Effect size data disaggregated for sub-groups, if available:

- Students with disabilities
- ELLs
- Students from diverse racial-ethnic groups
Intervention Tools Chart: Content and Language—Intensity

- Administration group size
- Duration of intervention
- Minimum interventionist requirements
Intensity

• **Administration group size:** the number of students who receive instruction simultaneously through the intervention program.

• **Duration of intervention:** includes time per intervention session, the number of sessions per week, and the duration of the intervention period.

• **Minimum interventionist requirements:** minimum standards set by the program regarding the qualifications of the individual implementing the program and the amount of time required for their training.
Intervention Tools Chart: Content and Language—Additional Research

- Additional research studies on the intervention
- Intervention reviewed by What Works Clearinghouse
Additional Research

• **Additional research studies:** By clicking on the ‘additional research studies’ rating for any intervention, you can find information that will allow you to access other studies of the intervention program that may not have been submitted to the TRC.

• **What Works Clearinghouse:** The What Works Clearinghouse is the Department of Education’s clearinghouse for programs, products, practices, and policies.
Step 5: Review the Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of MATH</td>
<td>Torgačević (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td>Redorowicz &amp; Trites (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of READING</td>
<td>Torgačević (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Vocabulary Connections</td>
<td>Nelson, Vadas, &amp; Sanders (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure Free Reading</td>
<td>Torgersen, Myers, Schirm, Stuart, Vartivarian, et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast ForWord Language Series</td>
<td>Miller, Merzenich, Tallal, Devivo, Linn, et al. (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focusMATH Intensive Intervention</td>
<td>Styers &amp; Baird-Wilkerson (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction Challenge</td>
<td>Fuchs, Schumacher, Long, Napolano, Heidt, et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 6: Get More Information

Study: Torgesen, Myers, Schirm, Stuart, Vartivarian, et al. (2006)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Information</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Acquisition and Cost</th>
<th>Program Specifications and Requirements</th>
<th>Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure Free Reading (FFR) is a research based, scientifically validated diagnostic/preventive reading intervention program designed to improve reading outcomes for students who have not responded to regular and/or remedial reading instruction. The program's unique combination of scaffolded support for the lowest level readers to immediately experience success with age- and grade-level appropriate passages regardless of current reading ability. FFR's unique language development approach to intervention is designed to rapidly build comprehensibility, vocabulary, and fluency, along with ability, confidence, and extensibility.</td>
<td>Failure Free Reading is intended for use in grades 1 through high school. It is designed for use with students with disabilities, including learning disabilities, mental retardation, behavioral disabilities, and students scoring 0-12% on standardized reading tests. English language learners and any student at risk of academic failure. The academic area of focus is reading (comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, spelling).</td>
<td>Where to obtain: Failure Free Reading 140 Callema Ave West, Danville, CA 94526 Phone: 800-223-7323 Website: <a href="http://www.failurefree.com">www.failurefree.com</a></td>
<td>Four hours of initial training is required for the instructor.</td>
<td>Four hours of initial training is required for the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlike most other commercial reading interventions, FFR combines word level instruction with context.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Costs: Failure Free Reading's Elementary, Secondary and Life Skills Solutions each consist of a $5,000 site level curriculum library (containing all teacher and student print materials, all of which are non-consumable), a 4% shipping &amp; handling fee (on just print materials), plus either online software seats at $150 per twelve month subscription, or the standalone/download edition of $1,800.</td>
<td>Failure Free Reading is designed for use with individual students or small groups of two to six students.</td>
<td>Failure Free Reading takes 45-60 minutes per session with a recommended five sessions per week for 4 to 50+ weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four hours of initial training is required for the instructor.</td>
<td>Failure Free Reading is designed for use with individual students or small groups of two to six students.</td>
<td>The training involves each participant going completely through the placement process, and an entire instructional cycle (solicit teacher lesson, talk to software, print output).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training is online and hands-on. Each participant is required to have access to a computer (with the software installed, or available via the Internet connection), and the print materials must be online.</td>
<td>Training is online and hands-on. Each participant is required to have access to a computer (with the software installed, or available via the Internet connection), and the print materials must be online.</td>
<td>The training involves each participant going completely through the placement process, and an entire instructional cycle (solicit teacher lesson, talk to software, print output).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuchs, Fuchs, Craddock, Hollenbeck, Hamlett, et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- Consider technical quality, relevance, and feasibility when selecting intervention programs.
- The tools chart provides a good base of information, but it will not tell you what program is right for you.
- The chart is not an exhaustive list of all programs.
- There is no perfect intervention program: Compare your needs and priorities to the information on the tools chart.
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