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Rita Bean • Jennifer Lillenstein

This article describes specific ideas for how teachers, principals, and specialized personnel can address the challenges of Response to Intervention initiatives in their schools.

One of the “very hot” topics in reading education in 2011 is that of Response to Intervention (RTI), as identified by literacy experts who were interviewed for the annual survey published in Reading Today (Cassidy, Ortieb, & Shettel, 2011). Some of those interviewed indicated that they were not quite sure how to define RTI. This uncertainty may exist because of the multiple dimensions of RTI, the ways in which it can be implemented, and the variations in how researchers, practitioners, and teacher educators define the term. As indicated by Wixson (Education Week, 2011), although RTI has become a popular school initiative, there is a need for more...
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RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION AND THE CHANGING ROLES OF SCHOOLWIDE PERSONNEL

There is also a need to learn from those educators who are directly involved in using an RTI framework for implementing reading programs. In schools where such efforts are underway, educators are dealing with changes in what they need to know, how they function in their classrooms, and how they interact with their colleagues. By visiting schools, observing in classrooms, and talking with educators in schools using an RTI framework, we were able to obtain an in-depth picture of how role expectations have changed for personnel in schools and, more specifically, what these practicing educators believed was essential for successful implementation of RTI.

We conducted this research study in five schools using an RTI framework. Our purpose was to obtain information that would facilitate the work of those undertaking such an initiative. We asked three specific questions as we visited the schools: What were the thoughts and perceptions of educators about their roles? In what ways had role and function expectations for them changed? What skill sets were essential if educators were to be effective in this systemic effort to improve instruction for all students?

The answers we received were consistent: RTI requires a different sort of climate in the school and a change in how educators teach, learn, and interact with others. We believe that the insights of these practicing educators provide useful information to others involved in schools using an RTI framework. By thinking about the responses that we received, school personnel may be able to plan more wisely, avoid pitfalls, and address possible challenges. Also, our findings may provide the basis for conversations that facilitate RTI implementation.

Opportunities to discuss the implementation of a new initiative enables educators to be proactive and prevent potential problems. We also highlight responses of participants that identify what they believe is important for preparing educators to work in schools using an RTI framework. Here, we provide some background about RTI and then briefly describe our approach to this study.

Pause and Ponder

- What are the major implications of this article for you in your role at your school?
- In what ways does the principal at your school set the conditions for positive communication and collaboration of teachers? What are the challenges to such collaboration?
- What specific ideas about the implementation of Response to Intervention were most surprising to you? Which do you view as most difficult to achieve in your school? Easiest to achieve?

Response to Intervention: What Is It?

In 2004, Response to Intervention (RTI) was written into U.S. law with the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004). This framework was developed because of concern about the large number of students being identified for special education services (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002) and the expectation that RTI, if implemented appropriately, would reduce that number and provide more effective instruction for students.

The RTI framework has had an impact on ways in which many elementary schools and a growing number of secondary schools assess and instruct students. One of the major changes in specific learning disability (SLD) evaluation is that schools are no longer required to use a discrepancy model for determining whether students meet criteria for SLD and are eligible for special education services; rather students can be identified based on how well they “respond” to instruction and intervention. It is this “response to instruction and intervention” that has changed the way that reading programs in many schools function. In other words, schools are using RTI as a vehicle for school improvement, providing a high-quality core program that addresses the needs of all students, and then developing or selecting robust, research-based approaches that meet the needs of students needing more targeted or intensive instruction.

Often, but not always, RTI models include three tiers: Tier 1 or primary instruction provided for all students; targeted or supplemental intervention, Tier 2; and Tier 3, intensive intervention. Interventions at Tier 2 or 3 may mean that students are taught in smaller groups, provided with additional instructional time, or taught by specialized personnel (e.g., the reading specialist, a special education teacher, a speech and language teacher). Moreover, to identify students who need such targeted or intensive instruction, schools have had to use data more consistently to inform instructional decision making on a systematic basis: Are students making progress? Is there a need to make changes in the approach used, the amount of additional instructional time, the size and composition of the group? Although there are different variations...
“Seven essential skills or competencies were identified consistently across schools and role groups as important to the success of RTI.”

We conducted this study because technical assistants from the state assigned to work in schools using an RTI framework had raised questions about how educators functioned in these schools, especially those with specialized roles (e.g., reading specialists/literacy coaches, special educators, speech and language teachers, psychologists). Additional questions were raised about the skills that these educators needed if they were to function effectively. To answer these questions, we sent a questionnaire to the principals of five elementary schools that had been using RTI as a framework for three years or more, requesting background information about the school. We then observed and interviewed personnel at these schools (see online-only research supplement for a more thorough description of the study, including school demographic information and methodology). We analyzed data collected from the questionnaire and visits to identify key components for successful implementation of RTI in schools.

Next we describe essential skills and competencies for personnel working in these schools and then discuss the importance of a culture of shared leadership. We draw some conclusions, identify implications, and make recommendations for those serving in RTI schools and for institutions involved in preparing candidates for positions in these schools.

Results

In discussing results, we rely on the voices of those interviewed to illustrate and bring to life the ways that RTI affected their roles in schools. When using actual quotations from those interviewed, we identify them only by role and do not specify the school in which any of them worked, thus maintaining their anonymity.

Essential Skills and Competencies

The following seven essential skills or competencies were identified consistently across schools and role groups as important to the success of RTI. Each necessitated changes in what personnel needed to know or be able to do. (See the Table for a summary of changes for each role group.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Literacy coach</th>
<th>Reading specialist</th>
<th>Special educator</th>
<th>Classroom teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased emphasis on empowering others</td>
<td>Greater emphasis on management and coordination</td>
<td>More focused, frequent intervention for selected students</td>
<td>Teaching students other than “my kids”</td>
<td>Data-based decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active involvement with implementation</td>
<td>Increased focus on evidence-based instruction</td>
<td>Informal support to teachers</td>
<td>More involvement with teaching the core literacy program</td>
<td>“Ownership” of students beyond those in homeroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the conditions for success</td>
<td>Team approach to coaching</td>
<td>Working more collaboratively with teachers</td>
<td>Working more collaboratively with teachers</td>
<td>Working more collaboratively with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Changes in Role Functions as Result of Response to Intervention Implementation
In-Depth Knowledge of Literacy Development and Instruction.
Regardless of role, all personnel emphasized the importance of understanding the components of reading acquisition and being able to deliver effective instruction that was evidence-based and focused on improving literacy learning for all students. Those interviewed often referred to the five essential components of reading (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000), the importance of writing in improving reading, and the key role of motivation as a means of developing both reading achievement and a love of reading.

Several principals talked about teaching lessons as a means of gaining a better understanding of literacy instruction or “keeping fresh” and to better understand teachers’ concerns. Literacy coaches indicated that, because of the professional development they had received, they were more knowledgeable about the literacy information that they provided to teachers. One literacy coach saw herself as a “true scientist-practitioner—teachers now know ‘why’ they are doing what they are doing... bringing the science to practice has been another part of my expanded role and function.”

In these schools, educators shared a common language about literacy; when discussing fluency, for example, they were familiar with its elements (accuracy, rate, prosody) and could discuss ideas about instruction (repeated readings, choral reading, partner reading). At the same time, they emphasized that it has taken them several years to “get where we are today” and recognized the need to continue to learn.

Specialized personnel, such as special educators and psychologists, highlighted the importance of having a deeper understanding of the core literacy curriculum, which in the past, had not been as important to them. As one special educator stated, “If you have a degree, you are teaching core.” Many of those interviewed indicated that they gained this knowledge of literacy instruction through the professional development that they received at their schools rather than from any teacher preparation or graduate program. A psychologist at one of the schools talked about learning about literacy instruction from the reading specialists in the building, “working with them as a team, asking them questions, and reading professional materials that they shared.”

Those interviewed cited the need to understand literacy instruction in enough depth that they could provide for both their strong readers, “placing them at a spot where they can thrive,” and also “taking lower achieving students and giving them the opportunity to learn what they need.” Classroom teachers, assigned to teach a group during “tiered” instruction, were often asked to teach students who had demonstrated average or above-average reading achievement. Their challenge was to provide instruction that encompassed higher level reading and thinking skills; several talked about using the Internet to locate appropriate ideas and materials.

A fourth-grade teacher at one school talked about the need to “incorporate content area reading during tier time.” Although in all instances, schools had an identified core and specific programs for targeted and intensive instruction, reading specialists and literacy coaches, as well as teachers, recognized that they had to make adjustments in how they used those materials, or provide other learning experiences or opportunities, if their students were to be successful.

Key Role of Data for Instructional Decision Making. All personnel recognized the need to be able to interpret and use the results of student performance across multiple measures.
to inform instruction and intervention for a given student. All schools used specific screening and progress-monitoring tests; at the same time, teachers were quick to point out the limitations of any one assessment: “sometimes they aren’t true for a child; she scores high and yet cannot tell you a thing she’s read.” Therefore, schools used teacher observations, rubrics, and student writing samples as sources of data. Decision making based on data was expected: As one principal stated, “I want teachers to ‘back up’ their judgments with evidence.” To use data effectively, there was a need for shared expertise, with reading specialists, principals, and psychologists offering their expertise in psychometrics, instruction, and so on.

For example, literacy coaches or specialists often facilitated grade-level meetings in which they worked with classroom teachers, helping them analyze data by asking, “What do we need to do? What might you do?” Teachers described a feeling of empowerment because of their exposure to these shared discussions and their growing ability to interpret data. One group of teachers commented, “before RTI, we relied on reading specialists to diagnose problems and to fix them. Now we look at the data ourselves.” They also indicated that they felt a greater sense of responsibility for meeting the needs of each student.

Several teachers indicated that they needed to have a more in-depth understanding of how assessment could help them make effective decisions about instruction; they recognized that they could no longer just identify problems—it was now their responsibility to help solve them. Reading specialists indicated that their instruction was much more focused because of the use of assessment results to make decisions about specific goals, approaches, and even the group assignments.

**Differentiation of Instruction.**

Classroom teachers and reading personnel often identified the ability to differentiate instruction as a cornerstone of effective implementation of RTI—and the most difficult to achieve. Effective differentiation was characterized as the ability to select appropriate and engaging materials and methods for specific students, management of whole- and small-group instruction, and continuity in instructional focus and intensity across instructors and settings through ongoing collaboration. In one school, where leveled texts were used for tier instruction, a skill or strategy was identified (e.g., identifying the main idea), and then taught during a specific week in all groups, but at the appropriate level.

Such differentiation could not occur without the support of the principals who created opportunities for differentiated instruction: developing schedules that increased the numbers of personnel available to teach small-group instruction; promoting co-teaching of classroom teachers with special educators, reading specialists, or English language learning teachers; providing resources for teachers; and giving personnel opportunities to meet so that they could discuss “what was working and not working.” Some principals gave teachers the freedom to decide which tiers to teach, how, and with whom they might co-teach, believing that “teachers had their own preferences and strengths; they need some autonomy.” Other principals made these decisions, often with the literacy coach or reading specialists, believing that they had a better sense of where specific teachers might be most effective.

Reading specialists felt that the scheduling in these schools gave them more opportunity to differentiate because they met more frequently with their students, generally four days a week. As one reading specialist indicated, “in past, kids were pulled and they were missing things...it was
frustrating...now the whole grade does skill groups at the same time...we teach at this time...kids are not missing anything.”

Collaboration. The most frequently mentioned disposition was the importance of being able to work with others toward a common goal, such as increasing student reading achievement or deprivatizing instruction. There was consensus that to collaborate effectively, there must be a sharing of and value for diverse perspectives and preparation to attain the larger goal of enhanced instructional decision making and improved student outcomes. Teachers, for example, provided in-depth information about students’ family background or described how specific students worked with their peers in the classroom, whereas reading specialists or special educators were able to identify reading needs or suggest alternative instructional approaches for students.

As one teacher indicated, “I was not prepared for the team mentality that I needed to be successful.” Reading specialists, like literacy coaches, were greatly involved in discussions with teachers about how to use assessment results effectively; they often served as members of data review teams. As highlighted by one reading specialist, “we are now able to discuss kids and make adjustments and share materials.” According to another reading specialist, “the mentality has changed; teachers no longer want me to ‘fix a student and then bring him back.’ Rather, they had joint responsibility for the students they shared; together they discussed student strengths and needs and made decisions about instruction.

Special educators noted the significance of collaboration; they no longer taught only “my kids.” Often they provided strategic or intensive instruction to groups of students that included some who had not been identified for special education. One special educator described in depth the coteaching she did with a first-grade teacher, first planning with her to decide what would be taught and how and then establishing a routine (who does what). This coteaching extended to the joint writing of a weekly newsletter for parents, giving them suggestions about how to work with their children.

Collaboration between reading specialists and literacy coaches was seen as critical. Specialists often served with coaches on the literacy leadership team where “we can argue with each other...have a heated discussion...have kids’ best interest in heart...get better instruction in classrooms.” This specialist–coach collaboration also resulted in a team approach to coaching in these schools. In one school in which there were several reading specialists, the literacy coach highlighted the fact that they (coach and specialists) “cleared their schedules so that teachers could meet with them as needed,” and indicated that any one of them could support teachers in their instructional efforts. In another school, the literacy coach stated, “I am able to use the interventionists [reading specialists] to help me with my role.... They are now facilitating meetings, doing data analysis, and supporting teachers.”

As part of this collaborative effort, flexibility was deemed a highly valued trait. According to several respondents, “If something isn’t working, I’m going to recognize that and do something different.” Flexibility was also manifested in other ways. Educators might be assigned to work with students from other classrooms or to assume responsibility to learn and use new strategies (e.g., develop a set of lessons for developing oral language of specific students). They might be asked to plan lessons for a group of students with a special educator or reading specialist. Sometimes this collaboration required that the two educators teach together in a classroom. At other times, the collaboration consisted of

“There was consensus that to collaborate effectively, there must be a sharing of and value for diverse perspectives....”
There was consensus among those interviewed that the collaboration in the school provided them with excellent learning opportunities. As one teacher indicated, “The collaboration is the best professional development. We talk about data and link it to instruction.” In another school, reading specialists and coach described the powerful impact of grade-level sessions in which teachers, using a case-study format, discussed how to address the needs of students “who are puzzling.” And one experienced first-grade teacher was emphatic that RTI and the collaborative discussions were important sources of learning for her: “this collaboration is more systematic...we are no longer islands...it opens up a whole new world for teachers.”

The grade-level and data analysis meetings provided opportunities for discussions of relevant professional books, new strategies, and ways to address student needs. In one school, during their faculty meetings held twice a month, reading specialists were responsible for bringing in one or two new ideas to share with teachers: teaching expository text; activities for before, during, and after reading; or strategies for reading multisyllabic words. One district had established a “collaboration day,” generally held once a month. A group of teachers could propose a reason for meeting together (e.g., third-grade teachers in a school decide to develop a rubric for writing). Substitutes would be hired and teachers would work together on the identified task during that day.

Leadership Skills. Leadership skills, which include interpersonal and communication skills, were mentioned frequently by specialized personnel who assumed responsibility for providing coaching or consultative support to classroom teachers. Significance was placed on skills related to the establishment of trust, assertive communication, active listening, and problem solving. Coaches and specialists highlighted the following as key aspects of leadership: learning to work as a member of a team, and leading or participating in conversations with individuals or in groups in which they might have to provide critical as well as positive feedback. Providing critical feedback was, for these respondents, a difficult but important skill. Three key guidelines were identified as important: (1) treating teachers with respect and valuing their input, (2) using data to support the message being delivered to teachers, and (3) putting the focus on student learning (e.g., what do we need to do to help this student learn?).

Several teachers also mentioned that they had to learn to work more effectively in groups with their colleagues, especially as they discussed student data across classrooms and how they might group and work with students other than those assigned to their classrooms. District leaders in one school mentioned that they saw a difference in teachers since the inception of RTI, with more teachers “stepping up and asking for leadership roles.”

Principals in each of these schools noted that they had the lead role in establishing conditions for effective implementation of RTI; being on the sidelines was not an option.

Facility With Technology. Because of the extensive use of data in these schools, specialized personnel identified facility with technology as important. Such a skill set requires both technical expertise and interpretive skills. Specialized personnel used technology to collect and review data and to monitor progress of students. Because technology facilitated the planning and instruction of teachers, they too indicated the importance of being technologically savvy. Their major use of technology was on using the Internet as a source of ideas for differentiating instruction or for increasing their own professional knowledge of literacy learning.

Shared Leadership: Developing a Community of Learners

In all five schools there was a climate that supported and encouraged shared leadership (Lambert, 1998). Such leadership is graphically portrayed in the Figure. The principal served as the central person for promoting a risk-free environment, leading the effort in establishing norms for collaboration, and facilitating shared responsibility and accountability. Effective implementation of RTI required that principals involve teachers in making instructional decisions as a means of “effective
capacity building and accountability via data."

One principal indicated, “I don’t have all the answers and I work better in a team than I do alone.” Two others summarized by stating, “we see our jobs as empowering people to make decisions...we give them what they need and help keep the focus on teaching and learning.” These two principals talked about the leadership they assumed in helping grade-level groups develop norms for meetings as one step in their effort to establish the school as a learning community. These norms were posted in the meeting room and included the following: Start and end on time; respect the views of others; have a focused agenda; and challenge ideas, not people. The principals talked about the fact that spending time on group process was a new activity for them and their teachers. They stressed the importance of having teachers develop the norms for these meetings. Perhaps this notion of empowering others was best summarized in a banner that was posted on a wall in one school: “We’re better together.”

District leadership was essential, providing support for the initiative. There was an emphasis on achieving the goals established by the RTI initiative and a singular focus on helping all students learn. All personnel were involved in setting goals and making decisions that related to improving student learning. In each school, there was a leadership team that included key personnel (e.g., reading specialists or coaches, special educators, the principal, a teacher leader). The team was responsible for reviewing schoolwide data, discussing successes and challenges, and suggesting ways to support teachers in their instructional efforts. Groups of teachers, most frequently grade-level teams, worked together, with reading specialists or the literacy coach, to discuss student progress and how they might change grouping or instruction to meet student needs.

Finally, individual teachers served as literacy leaders in the school. Some had formal roles (e.g., reading specialists and coaches, special educators, speech and language teachers). Frequently, it was the literacy coach or reading specialist who assumed a coordination or management role. As stated by a principal, “the literacy coach keeps all levels rolling; she has a management position. I meet often with her, often daily...it could be more than once a day.” Another principal counted on the literacy coach to “set the tone... respect teachers and their work.” Or as mentioned by a coach in another school, “I’m in on everything.”

In other words, although principals were involved in RTI implementation, they counted on the literacy coaches to manage the initiative and to provide principals with essential information about assessment and instruction: which of the Tier 3 students are continuing to struggle and what should we do next? How can we help the third-grade teachers address the comprehension needs of their students? Do we need to provide additional professional development and how?

At the same time, classroom teachers with experience or special expertise often functioned informally, providing ideas and information for their peers. At each of the schools, teachers often identified another teacher as an important source of ideas, materials, and encouragement. In one school, experienced teachers, assigned to a specific tier group, were paired with inexperienced teachers as a means of helping these novices learn.

“Frequently, it was the literacy coach or reading specialist who assumed a coordination or management role.”
Decision making was not top-down but occurred recursively between and among individuals and groups of teachers, principals, and district leadership. Shared leadership was distributed differently in these five schools because of differences in available personnel and school organization, but in all instances, each principal recognized the importance of and was influenced by the work of teachers and specialized personnel in the school.

Conclusions
The visits to these schools provided insights about how individuals within a school might function as a collective to implement an effective reading program for students and reinforced the importance of schools as communities of learners. More important, the findings indicate that schools can make RTI a reality. They also identify the need for change in how schools—and individuals within those schools—function, and they provide specific information about what those changes were in these five schools. Although there were variations in how specialized reading personnel, both literacy coach and reading specialist, functioned, generally the literacy coach focused on the coordination of the reading program and coaching role, whereas the reading specialist provided instruction to students. However, reading specialists were often involved in informal coaching. Special educators saw differences in how they functioned, requiring them to have a deeper understanding of the core curriculum and an ability to instruct students other than those identified as eligible for special education. Classroom teachers no longer could close their doors and decide independently what and how they would teach. They were required to work collaboratively with others—not only their grade-level colleagues, but also specialized personnel. They shared responsibility for all students and used data to make instructional decisions.

2. To meet the challenges for change in RTI schools, educators working in those schools must possess or develop the essential skills and competencies needed for effective implementation. The development of these competencies requires that schools have a “comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving teachers’ and principals’ effectiveness in raising student achievement” (Learning Forward, 2010, p. 16). In these five schools, we saw evidence of the following aspects of effective professional development: a focus on student learning; emphasis on understanding the content of literacy; sustained, ongoing collaborative efforts; active learning of teachers; and coaching support. What was evident in these schools was the acknowledgment by those interviewed that they, as well as their students, were learners.

There are a variety of approaches that school leaders can use to develop schools as places of learning for both students and teachers: the development of study groups or book clubs, lesson study, classroom walkthroughs, and so on (see Bean & Dagen, 2011, for a description of activities for building learning communities in schools). The key is to select activities that enable a specific school to accomplish its goals. In addition to school-based professional development, individual educators can increase their knowledge of literacy instruction by joining professional organizations that provide valuable sources of relevant information, attending meetings of local literacy councils, reading professional materials, and registering for advanced graduate work.

3. The culture of the school must change from one in which teachers

“Change in how personnel in schools function is an inevitable aspect of implementing RTI effectively. And change is required of all personnel.”
operate in isolation to one in which they function as a team: working to set high expectations for the students they serve, implementing effective instructional practices, and always evaluating their work as a means of improving student learning. This can happen only if principals set the tone for such a climate by providing opportunities for and promoting collaboration; they model effective leadership skills and encourage personnel to serve as teacher leaders. In Take Action, we provide a set of steps that can be helpful in establishing a school as a place of learning. The findings of this study support the notions identified in the IRA position statement (2002) on RTI:

- RTI implementation must be part of a comprehensive, systemic approach to literacy instruction and assessment, one in which each educator understands the ways in which he or she can contribute to student learning.
- RTI is a collaborative effort, and time and resources must be allocated for collaboration to occur. Educators must be provided with the staff development they need to learn in new and different ways.

Implications

The visits to these schools lead to possible implications for schools, universities, or colleges preparing personnel for their roles in schools, as researchers, and in professional organizations.

1. Schools—This study as well as others (Saunders, Goldenberg, & Gallimore, 2009; Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010) have highlighted the importance of schools as communities of learners, in which there are opportunities for educators to collaborate, reflect, and inquire as they work together to improve student learning. To establish schools with such a climate, school leaders will need to rethink both the content and structure of professional development, make organizational changes that facilitate teacher collaboration, and assist school personnel so that they are comfortable with the notion of shared leadership as a means of facilitating student learning.

2. Universities and colleges—Those graduating from various preparation programs will need a solid foundation and understanding of literacy acquisition, instruction, and assessment, as well as the skills and dispositions that enable them to work effectively with others. All individuals within a school, teachers included, have the responsibility to serve as literacy leaders. Although principals are key, they cannot transform schools alone; rather, they set the conditions that promote leadership of others. Reading specialists, literacy coaches, and special educators have a more formal leadership role, whereas classroom teachers can informally serve as leaders by being available to talk with and support their peers.

3. Researchers—More research is necessary to gain a better understanding of how RTI works within a school, that is, how it supports whole-school reform. Such research should investigate how well such schools are implementing approaches and procedures that make a difference for the students they serve.

4. Professional organizations—Various organizations (e.g., International Reading Association, National Council of Teachers of English, American Speech and Hearing Association, National Association of Elementary Principals) that develop sets of standards or qualifications for their members may be able to use the results of this study to inform their work.

TAKE ACTION!

1. Establish a leadership team to discuss the value of the school as a learning community and how to begin.
2. Conduct a needs assessment of the literacy program that enables the leadership team to establish goals based on those needs.
3. Establish processes for team meetings, including the development of norms.
4. Provide for teacher choice in meeting goals (selection of books to read, specific goals to address).
5. Provide time needed for teacher collaboration: changes in scheduling, maximum use of personnel, hire substitutes, and so forth.
6. Encourage collaboration and reflective dialogue among teachers.
7. Continue to evaluate the results of your efforts and make changes as needed.
Notes

The RTI initiative is called Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTII) in Pennsylvania. The authors wish to thank those individuals who provided leadership and support for this project: Joy Eichelberger, Angela Kirby-Wehr, Wendy Farone, and Dennis Cullen, Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network; Ed Shapiro, Lehigh University; and Joe Kowaleski, Indiana University of Pennsylvania. They also extend their appreciation to the teachers and administrators at the schools they visited for their willingness to share their experiences.
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