

## Individual Problem Solving Form

Student name: Andy 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?)

<b>Student present level of performance:</b> <i>3rd Grade DORF = 41 cwpm (median); 87% accuracy (median); Daze = 3</i>
<b>Expected student level of performance:</b> <i>3rd Grade DORF Winter benchmark – DORF = 86 cwpm; 96% accuracy; Daze = 11 Hudson School District 3<sup>rd</sup> grade averages – DORF = 101 cwpm; 96% accuracy; Daze = 10</i>
<b>Magnitude of discrepancy:</b> <i>from DIBELS benchmarks = -45 cwpm (2.1 times discrepant); -9% accuracy; 8 Daze (3.7 times discrepant) from District Avg = -60 cwpm (2.5 times discrepant); -9% accuracy; 7 Daze (3.3 times discrepant)</i>
<b>Problem Definition:</b> <i>Andy is currently reading a median of 41 cwpm with 87% accuracy on 3<sup>rd</sup> grade DIBELS Next ORF passages, with a score of 3 on the Daze comprehension measure. The 3<sup>rd</sup> grade winter benchmark is 86 cwpm with 96% accuracy, and 11 on the Daze. 3<sup>rd</sup> graders in the district are currently reading an average of 101 cwpm with 96% accuracy with a score of 10 on the Daze.</i>
<b>Replacement behavior or target skill:</b> <i>Andy should currently be reading 86 cwpm with 96% accuracy on the DORF and 11 on the Daze.</i>

### 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>	<b>Core instruction</b> – 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 <b>Intervention</b> – 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 &amp; sequence, expected outcomes, previous interventions, etc)</i>	<b>Core instruction</b> – 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) <b>Intervention</b> - Phonics for Reading: small group focused on phonics (r-controlled vowels, vowel combinations, prefixes); scope and sequence covering some of his 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>	<b>Core instruction</b> – 22 students, PBIS effectively used, clear expectations & rules posted and reviewed regularly, good peer interactions; no significant environmental challenges observed <b>Intervention</b> – 8 students, great behavior management, no environmental challenges observed
Learner <i>(e.g. academic skills, behavioral concerns, etc)</i>	<b>DIBELS</b> – see above; <b>Quick Phonics Screener</b> (see attached); <b>OAKS</b> – Reading = 13 <sup>th</sup> percentile, Math = 34 <sup>th</sup> percentile; <b>Core Assessments:</b> 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 *Andy lacks decoding strategies for r-controlled vowels, and consonant digraphs & blends. His current curriculum does not address these particular skills and strategies with enough opportunities to practice and master them. In his larger core group, he does not receive enough individual corrective feedback, which leads to him practicing errors.*

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

**Data used to validate hypothesis:** *Observations of his instructional groups and a review of student work indicate better student engagement and higher student success when he 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: \_\_\_\_\_ Andy \_\_\_\_\_

Grade: 3

Date: 2/15/12

Target skill: Phonic Decoding/Oral Reading Accuracy & Fluency

Goal (This intervention will be successful if...): *By April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012 (8 Instructional weeks), when given a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade DIBELS Next ORF passage, Andy 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>Andy will receive instruction using Phonics for Reading, 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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>Phonics for Reading 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 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012

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

\*Attach graphed data

<b>Attendance:</b>	# of intervention days attended: <b>39</b>	Total # of intervention days: <b>40</b>	% of intervention sessions attended: <b>98%</b>
<b>Intervention fidelity data:</b> <i>Across 8 observations, an average of 87% of components implemented</i>			<b>Minimum standard met?</b> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<b>Student rate of progress:</b>	<i>.9 cwpm per week</i>	<b>Peer/Expected rate of progress:</b>	<i>2 cwpm per week</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Less progress than expectation/peers</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>More progress</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Same progress</b>			
<b>Student level of performance:</b>	<i>48 cwpm, 89% accuracy</i>	<b>Expected student level of performance:</b>	<i>86 cwpm, 96% acc (Winter) 100 cwpm, 96% acc (Spring)</i>
<b>Magnitude of discrepancy:</b>	<i>From Winter DIBELS benchmark = -38 cwpm (1.8 times discrepant), -7% accuracy From Spring DIBELS benchmark = -52 cwpm (2.1 times discrepant), -7% accuracy</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Less discrepant than expectation/peers</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>More discrepant</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Same level of discrepancy</b>			
<b>If less discrepant/good progress:</b> Continue current intervention? Yes No Fade intervention support? Yes No			
<b>If more discrepant/poor progress:</b> Was the intervention implemented as planned? Yes No Refer for special education evaluation and intensify supports? Yes No			
<b>If discrepancy the same/average progress:</b> Was the intervention implemented as planned? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Refer for special education evaluation and intensity supports? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No			
<b>Comments/Actions/Next Steps:</b> <i>While Andy made good progress in the Phonics for Reading curriculum and showed a high level of academic success in that curriculum, he made little progress in his progress monitoring data. He did not generalize the skills he learned in the intervention to his daily work and reading. As a result, he will be referred to the evaluation planning team to decide if an initial evaluation for special education eligibility will be conducted.</i>			