

Individual Problem Solving Form

Student name: Rita

Grade: 3

Date: 2/15/12

Problem Solving Team Members: *Mrs. Vance (teacher), Mr. Wallace (Principal), Mr. Howard (lit specialist), Mrs. Levensen (school psych), Mrs. Martin (Parent)*

Area of concern:
(circle primary area)

Behavior

Reading

Math

Writing

Other (describe)

Step 1: Problem Identification (What is the problem?)

Student present level of performance: 3rd Grade DORF = 37 cwpm (median); 85% accuracy (median); Daze = 3
Expected student level of performance: 3rd Grade DORF Winter benchmark – DORF = 86 cwpm; 96% accuracy; Daze = 11 Hudson School District 3 rd grade averages – DORF = 101 cwpm; 96% accuracy; Daze = 10
Magnitude of discrepancy: from DIBELS benchmarks = -49 cwpm (2.3 times discrepant); -11% accuracy; 8 Daze (3.7 times discrepant) from District Avg = -60 cwpm (2.5 times discrepant); -9% accuracy; 7 Daze (3.3 times discrepant)
Problem Definition: Rita is currently reading a median of 37 cwpm with 85% accuracy on 3 rd grade DIBELS Next ORF passages, with a score of 3 on the Daze comprehension measure. The 3 rd grade winter benchmark is 86 cwpm with 96% accuracy, and 11 on the Daze. 3 rd graders in the district are currently reading an average of 101 cwpm with 96% accuracy with a score of 10 on the Daze.
Replacement behavior or target skill: Rita should currently be reading 86 cwpm with 96% accuracy on the DORF and 11 on the Daze.

Step 2: Problem Analysis (Why is it happening?)

Domain	Relevant Known Information
Instruction <i>(e.g. pacing, corrective feedback, explicitness, opportunities to practice, engagement, etc)</i>	Core instruction – 60 min whole group (choral fluency reading, teacher modeling of comp & vocab strategies) 30 minute small group guided reading (modeling, partner reading, group responding); not much corrective feedback provided (<80%), low target student engagement Intervention – 45 min direct instruction (I do, we do, you do), errors corrected at a higher rate (>90%), moderate pacing (4 to 5 opportunities to respond per minute), moderate engagement
Curriculum <i>(e.g. skills taught, instructional materials, scope & sequence, expected outcomes, previous interventions, etc)</i>	Core instruction – Treasures: whole group (vocab, comprehension, choral reading); small group (leveled readers, oral reading, phonics instruction focused on vowel combinations, prefixes and suffixes), teacher reported that scope and sequence is moving quickly for target student, low level of student academic success in curriculum (<70% success rate during oral and written responses) Intervention – Reading Mastery: small group focused on phonics (r-controlled vowels, vowel combinations, prefixes); scope and sequence covering some of her missing decoding skills, higher academic success (80-85% success rate during oral and written responses)
Environment <i>(e.g. room setup, peer influence, expectations and rules, behavior management system, etc)</i>	Core instruction – 22 students, PBIS effectively used, clear expectations & rules posted and reviewed regularly, good peer interactions; no significant environmental challenges observed Intervention – 8 students, great behavior management, no environmental challenges observed
Learner <i>(e.g. academic skills, behavioral concerns, etc)</i>	DIBELS – see above; Quick Phonics Screener (see attached); OAKS – Reading = 13 th percentile, Math = 34 th percentile; Core Assessments: Comprehension Avg = 55%, Vocab = 85%.

Based on the above information (instruction, curriculum, environment, & learner) why do you think the current problem is occurring and what is the predicted result of an appropriately matched intervention?

Problem Hypothesis: The problem is occurring because Rita lacks decoding strategies for r-controlled vowels, and consonant digraphs & blends. Her current curriculum does not address these particular skills and strategies with enough opportunities to practice and master them. In her larger core group, she does not receive enough individual corrective feedback, which leads to her practicing errors.

Prediction: The problem will be reduced if Rita receives small group (<7 students) direct instruction in the skills described above. It should include a high rate of responding (at least 6-8 opportunities to respond per minute) and careful attention to immediately correct her errors.

Data used to validate hypothesis: Observations of her instructional groups and a review of student work indicate better student engagement and higher student success when she is in small group instruction (<70% success in large group core vs. 80-85% success in small group intervention). The Quick Phonics Screener, as well as a review of student work, indicates difficulties with the decoding skills listed above.

Do you have enough information to complete the problem analysis and develop an intervention? If no, what else is needed and who will be responsible for collecting it? Yes

Step 3: Plan Development (What are we going to do?)

Student name: _____ Rita _____

Grade: __3__

Date: __2/15/12__

Target skill: __Phonic Decoding/Oral Reading Accuracy & Fluency__

Goal (The intervention will be successful if...): *By April 24th, 2012 (8 Instructional weeks), when given a 3rd grade DIBELS Next ORF passage, Rita will orally read 57 cwpm with 95% accuracy.*

What will be done? (actions taken, target skills taught, curriculum/materials used)	How will it be done? (instructional strategies, etc)	Who is responsible?	Where will it occur?	How often? (days per week & min per day?)	Group size?
<i>Rita will receive instruction using Reading Mastery, focusing on r-controlled vowels, consonant digraphs and blends.</i>	<i>Direct instruction, think-pair-share, immediate corrective feedback from the teacher with lots of extra opportunities to practice. Daily error data will be taken and each daily lesson will start with a review of the previous day's errors and end with a review of the current day's errors with lots of extra opportunities to practice.</i>	<i>Mrs. Beasley</i>	<i>Title I room</i>	<i>5 days/week 45 min/day</i>	<i>5</i>
Progress monitoring plan	What materials will be used?	Who is responsible?	How often?	Decision Rule?	
	<i>DIBELS Next 3rd grade ORF passages</i>	<i>Mrs. Beasley (interventionist)</i>	<i>Once per week on Thursdays</i>	<i>4 consecutive points below the aimline indicate a need to change intervention</i>	
Fidelity plan	What data will be collected?	Who is responsible?	How often will it be collected?	Minimum standard for fidelity?	
	<i>Reading Mastery Implementation Integrity Direct Observation Checklist (see attached)</i>	<i>Mr. Howard (literacy coach)</i>	<i>Once per week</i>	<i>Minimum average of 80% of components implemented with fidelity</i>	

Follow up date: __April 26rd, 2012__

Step 4: Plan Implementation & Evaluation (Did it work?)

*Attach graphed data

Attendance:	# of intervention days attended: 39	Total # of intervention days: 40	% of intervention sessions attended: 98%
Intervention fidelity data: <i>Across 3 observations, an average of 95% of components implemented</i>			Minimum standard met? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Student rate of progress:	<i>.4 cwpm per week</i>	Peer/Expected rate of progress:	<i>2 cwpm per week</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less progress than expectation/peers <input type="checkbox"/> More progress <input type="checkbox"/> Same progress			
Student level of performance:	<i>40 cwpm, 85% accuracy</i>	Expected student level of performance:	<i>86 cwpm, 96% acc (Winter) 100 cwpm, 96% acc (Spring)</i>
Magnitude of discrepancy:	<i>From Winter DIBELS benchmark = -46 cwpm (2.2 times discrepant), -11% accuracy From Spring DIBELS benchmark = -52 cwpm (2.1 times discrepant), -7% accuracy</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Less discrepant than expectation/peers <input type="checkbox"/> More discrepant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same level of discrepancy			
If less discrepant/good progress: Continue current intervention? Yes No Fade intervention support? Yes No			
If more discrepant/poor progress: Was the intervention implemented as planned? Yes No Do we need to Intensify supports? Yes No Refer for special education evaluation? Yes No			
If discrepancy the same/average progress: Was the intervention implemented as planned? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Do we need to Intensify supports? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Refer for special education evaluation? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			
Comments/Actions/Next Steps: <i>While Rita made good progress in the Reading Mastery curriculum and showed a high level of academic success in that curriculum, she made little progress in her progress monitoring data. She did not generalize the skills she learned in the intervention to her daily work and reading. As a result, she will be referred to the evaluation planning team to decide if an initial evaluation for special education eligibility will be conducted.</i>			