

Errors of Implementation

September 2017

WWW.KSDETASN.ORG/MTSS



The focus of the Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) is to provide an integrated systemic approach that supports students in their ability to achieve high academic, behavioral and social standards, in a manner that is intentional, responsive, and preventative. The ongoing work of an MTSS is sustained through effective leadership, the creation and nurturing of an empowering culture, and the targeted ongoing professional development of every stakeholder involved. At the center of this framework is a set of evidence-based practices and procedures in the areas of curriculum, instruction and assessment. These practices are supported by research and promote the ability of the system to gather, analyze, and use data for instructional decision making across all levels, including the classroom, school building, and district. As straight forward as this description of MTSS may be, it is important not to become side-tracked allowing practices that support critical features of MTSS as described in the *Kansas Multi-Tier System of Supports: Innovation Configuration Matrix (ICM)* and/or replacing component parts of the framework with other information or strategies that may contradict the research behind MTSS practices.

A critical feature of the MTSS is adherence to a set of scientifically researched and evidence-based practices. Through ongoing examination and study, researchers have found each of these practices to be effective within a specific context, and when carried out in a specific manner. Conversely, when adapted or varied it is not possible to know if the practice will be effective (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1987). Thus, to achieve the desired effect of an MTSS (e.g. improved student outcomes, functional systems, etc.), it is imperative that the system components, practices and procedures are implemented with fidelity and monitored for effectiveness.

To help teams navigate these waters, some common implementation errors and examples are presented below. Because these same errors have been observed repeatedly to produce detrimental effects on successful implementation, teams need to take heed and avoid the following pitfalls.

Inappropriate Intervention Protocols (aka Using the Old System as the Framework):

- Tier 3 DOES NOT EQUAL Special Education (although some students receiving special education services may receive Tier 3 supports)
- Students should NOT only be supported by a “Specialist” (e.g. SPED students with SPED teacher, Title students with Title teacher, etc.)
- Sit Team does not replace the building-wide system for moving students into and out of intervention

Using the Wrong Tool or Misusing Universal Screening Information:

- Determining student intervention groups and planning intervention instruction based on state assessment indicators does not address the underlying academic deficits or needs for enrichment and therefore is unlikely to impact long term student outcomes
- Not using office discipline data (ODR) to inform school-wide behavior systems at the Tier 1 level does not allow for analysis of the core behavioral curriculum, and therefore will result in overwhelm of resources at Tiers 2 and 3.

Lack of Systemic Intervention System:

- Providing intervention time during core instruction is NOT an MTSS practice. When student data indicate that support beyond the core is necessary, this intervention time should be provided IN ADDITION TO the core instruction time as recommended in each content area.
- Differentiation is a key component of effective core instruction and does not constitute “intervention.”

- MTSS is not a “buffet style” initiative where individual teachers choose what pieces they would like to implement and if they would like to implement. Benefits for students will be most robust when all adults in the building participate in a collaborative manner, from delivering instruction and intervention to reviewing data and making instructional decisions and modifications based on those data.
- Efforts must be across the whole system ideally with a district leadership team, but at least with building leadership teams, taking responsibility for creating the comprehensive structures for implementation.
- MTSS must not be viewed primarily as a special education or general education responsibility; rather it must be embraced as an instructional responsibility of all adults in a building.

Inadequate or Incomplete Data Systems:

- Departure from the principles and practices identified in the Kansas MTSS ICM will result in data that are less rigorous for decision making, and potentially incompatible with the MTSS decision making process for student instruction.
- Data review must allow for fluid grouping of students based on screening and student progress monitoring data during intervention. Entry and exit criteria for interventions must be established and followed so that students can receive intervention as rapidly as they are identified as needing support, and can be released from intervention when the data indicate that intervention is no longer needed.

Curricular Misconceptions:

- Effective instructional strategies are PART of a comprehensive curriculum, but do not replace the systemic curricular protocol.
- MTSS implementation, using universal screening, creates a system in which all students are participants. MTSS is not something that is DONE to students, nor is it the process for the determination of eligibility for entitlement programs (e.g., Special Education, ESOL, etc.). Rather it is a process by which students are identified as needing support and matched with appropriate supports and thus provides data to inform entitlement evaluation processes.
- Meeting the needs of ALL students is the primary focus of an MTSS. MOST students should meet basic proficiency with core instruction. When this is not the case, the core curriculum and fidelity to that curriculum in its implementation should be examined rather than attempting to “fix” all the learning deficits in Tiers 2 and 3.

While the Kansas MTSS can and should be used as a broad framework for improving outcomes for students, the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) does not mandate its use. Schools are free to choose whether they undertake the MTSS; however, if the choice is made to structure and implement this systems-level change effort, fidelity to the framework and protocols will result in much more robust outcomes for students. Buildings that choose to structure to prepare for implementation of an MTSS locally are encouraged to secure the services of Recognized MTSS Facilitators, who will guide teams through the process using the *Kansas MTSS Structuring and Implementation Guides* specific to each content area, as well as other tools to ensure the integrity of the process. Keep in mind that this is a multi-year process, requiring that buildings engage in both structuring AND implementation to properly build the system and keep it running effectively and efficiently.

References

Baer, D. M., Wolf, M. M., & Risley, T. R. (1987). Some still-current dimensions of applied behavior analysis, *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 20, 313-327.

The contents of this resource were developed under an agreement from the Federal Department of Education to the Kansas State Department of Education. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and endorsement by the Kansas State Department of Education or the Federal Government should not be assumed. Kansas MTSS is funded through Part B funds administered by the Kansas State Department of Education's Early Childhood, Special Education and Title Services. Keystone Learning Services does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, or age in this program and activities. The following person has been designated to handle inquiries regarding the non-discrimination policies: Keystone Learning Services Executive Director, 500 E. Sunflower Blvd, Olathe, KS 66070, 785-876- 2214.