



RTI/MTSS for Behavior: District-Wide Planning Tool

Directions: Use this planning tool to audit your district or school RTI/MTSS system for behavioral/social-emotional support and select those priority goals that should be addressed immediately. To complete it:

- appoint a recorder.
- review each RTI/MTSS goal and rate on a scale of 0 (low) to 3 (high), the goal's current priority for your district.
- use the Discussion Notes column to record any notes from your discussion.
- when you have completed this planning tool, count up the goals with priority ratings of 2 or higher. Use this subset of priorities as a starting point for generating an RTI/MTSS-behavior plan for your school or district.

Tier 1: School-Wide Behavioral Expectations. The school has defined universal behavioral expectations for all students and staff—and trained the school community in those behaviors.

RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.1] Develop School-Wide Behavioral Expectations. To establish its "behavior curriculum", the school develops a general set of universal behavioral expectations that apply in any setting.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1..... 23	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.2] Translate School-Wide Expectations into Site-Specific Rules. The school (1) identifies the range of different settings in which students are expected to function, (2) determines the adult(s) responsible for managing behavior in each of these settings, and (3) enlists these supervising adults to translate building-wide expectations for behavior into more detailed site-specific rules.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1..... 23	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.3] Teach Expected Behaviors to Students. The school trains students in expected behaviors—treating those behaviors as a formal curriculum to be taught.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1..... 23	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.4] Reinforce Positive Behaviors. The school adopts a building-wide system to consistently acknowledge and reinforce positive student behaviors. This system includes adoption of tokens to be distributed contingent on positive behavior (e.g., 'good behavior tickets'), a mechanism to redeem earned tokens for individual or group rewards, and linking of awarded tokens to praise for the observed positive behaviors.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1..... 23	



Tier 1: Class-Wide Management. Well-managed classrooms are built on a foundation that includes teaching behavioral expectations to students and using proactive strategies to manage group behaviors.		
RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.5] Teach Expected Behaviors. The teacher teaches, reviews, monitors, and reinforces expected classroom behaviors tied to school-wide behavioral expectations (Simonsen et al., 2008).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.6] Post Classroom Rules. The classroom has a set of 3-8 rules or behavioral expectations posted. When possible, those rules are stated in positive terms as 'goal' behaviors (e.g. 'Students participate in learning activities without distracting others from learning'). Rules are frequently reviewed (Simonsen, Fairbanks, Briesch, Myers, & Sugai, 2008).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.7] Establish Classroom Routines. The teacher has established routines to deal with common classroom activities such as transitioning between activities (Fairbanks, Sugai, Guardino, & Lathrop, 2007; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.8] Engage in Active Supervision. The teacher moves frequently through the classroom--strategically recognizing positive behaviors while redirecting students who are off-task (De Pry & Sugai, 2002).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.9] Use Positive Communication. The teacher consistently uses positive communication strategies--such as behavior-specific praise and pre-correction statements (reminders of expected behaviors) -- to shape student behaviors in the desired direction (Stormont & Reinke, 2009).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.10] Provide Supportive Consequences. The teacher accesses a continuum of supportive strategies (e.g., reminder, redirection; reteaching of behavior, etc.) when responding to inappropriate behaviors. (Leach & Helf, 2016).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.11] Employ Negative Consequences Sparingly. The teacher makes limited use of 'contingent' (negative) consequences to reduce inappropriate behavior. The instructor accesses negative consequences only after first (a) trying supportive consequences, and (b) ruling out explanations for the misbehavior that lie beyond the student's control (e.g., skill deficit in the desired replacement behavior). (Conroy & Sutherland, 2012).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	



Tier 1: Classroom Interventions. Because the teacher is the Tier 1 (classroom) RTI/MTSS ‘first responder’ who can potentially assist any struggling student, schools should prepare necessary resources and define clear guidelines for how to implement Tier 1 behavioral interventions.

RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.12] Access Consultant Support. The teacher can easily access a behavioral consultant to assist in creating a student intervention plan to address behavioral/social-emotional concerns.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.13] Follow a Structured Process. The teacher follows a consistent RTI/MTSS problem-solving process in creating the intervention plan (Bergan, 1995).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.14] Choose Evidence-Based Interventions. Strategies included in the intervention plan are evidence-based-- i.e., supported by published research (Hawken, Vincent & Schumann, 2008).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.15] Track Student Progress. The teacher has set a goal for improvement in the intervention plan and selected at least one method of formative data collection (e.g., Behavior Report Card) to monitor the student’s progress toward the goal during the intervention.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.16] Allocate Sufficient Time. The intervention plan is scheduled to span a minimum length of time (e.g., 4-8 instructional weeks) sufficient to allow the teacher to fully judge its effectiveness.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.17] Document the Intervention. The teacher uses an online Content Management System (e.g., RTIm Direct) or an electronic or paper form to record details of the intervention plan. This documentation is completed <i>prior</i> to the start of the intervention and archived for later retrieval.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.1.18] Ensure Multi-Staff Participation. In settings with more than one educator (e.g., co-taught classrooms), all adults in that setting implement the student’s intervention plan consistently.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	

Tier 2: Strategic Interventions. Tier 2 interventions target students who need behavior and/or social-emotional support that goes beyond that which can be provided in the classroom. Tier 2 interventions can take the form of small group programs, mentoring support, or individual counseling. Tier 2 interventions are often ‘standard-protocol’ programs that match common student intervention needs in a school.

RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
------------------	------------------------	------------------



<input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.1] Inventory Evidence-Based Services. The school has inventoried its Tier 2 services and verified that all are 'evidence-based'-- i.e., supported by published research (Hawken, Vincent & Schumann, 2008). This inventory may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • group-delivered interventions (e.g., social-skills training programs); • mentoring programs (e.g., Check & Connect); • individual counseling (e.g., Solution-Focused Brief Counseling); • individualized behavior plans to be implemented across at least 2 instructional settings. 	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.2] Use Data for Recruitment. At several checkpoints during the instructional year, the school identifies students for Tier 2 services through use of one or more objective data sources (e.g., school-wide behavioral screening tools; attendance records; Office Disciplinary Referrals) with specific cut-points (Grosche & Volpe, 2013; McIntosh, Chard, Bolan, & Horner, 2006).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.3] Convene Team to Place Students in Tier 2 Services. The school convenes a team (e.g., 'Data Analysis Team') that meets periodically (e.g., every 5 weeks) to review school-wide behavioral, attendance, and social-emotional data, to identify at-risk students, and to place them in appropriate Tier 2 services (Mitchell, Stormont & Gage, 2011).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.4] Make Timely Assignments. Once identified as qualifying for Tier 2 services, students are placed in those services with little or no delay (e.g., within 1-2 weeks of initial referral) (Mitchell, Stormont & Gage, 2011).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.5] Exit Students. At the start of any RTI-behavioral intervention, the school establishes clear outcome goals/criteria for success to allow it to exit students whose data indicate that they no longer require Tier 2 support (Hawken, Vincent & Schumann, 2008).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.6] Verify Quality of Implementation. 'Intervention integrity' data are collected periodically (e.g., via direct observation; interventionist self-rating; and/or permanent products from the intervention) to verify that the Tier 2/3 intervention plan is carried out as designed (Gansle & Noell, 2007; Roach & Elliott, 2008). NOTE: Student attendance is a key aspect of intervention integrity and should equal or exceed 80%.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	



<p><input type="checkbox"/> [B.2.7] Track Student Progress. Every Tier 2 intervention plan has at least one source of data (e.g., Behavior Report Card; behavioral frequency count) to be used to track the student's targeted behavior(s) (Grosche & Volpe, 2013). Tier 3 plans have at least 2 data sources.</p> <p>Before beginning the intervention, the school establishes a desired outcome goal that defines the minimum level of acceptable improvement during the intervention timespan. During the intervention, data are collected periodically (e.g., daily; weekly) to assess progress toward the outcome goal.</p>	<p>Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3</p>	
---	--	--

Tier 3: Intensive: RTI/MTSS Problem-Solving Team. General-education students needing Tier 3 academic or behavioral services take up the greatest amount of RTI/MTSS resources and are at risk for referral to special education if they fail to improve. These high-stakes cases require the RTI/MTSS Problem-Solving Team, which follows a customized, team-based 'problem-solving' approach.

RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
<p><input type="checkbox"/> [B.3.1] Establish a Tier 3 RTI/MTSS Problem-Solving Team. The school has an 'RTI Problem-Solving Team' to create customized intervention plans for individual students who require Tier 3 (intensive) social-emotional and/or behavioral interventions (Eber, Sugai, Smith & Scott. (2002).). The RTI/MTSS Problem-Solving Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has created clear guidelines for when to accept a Tier 3 student referral. • identifies the function(s) that support problem behaviors of any referred student to better select appropriate interventions. • follows a consistent, structured problem-solving model during its meetings. • schedules (1) initial meetings to discuss student concerns and (2) follow-up meetings to review student progress and judge whether the intervention plan is effective. • develops written intervention plans with sufficient detail to ensure that the intervention is implemented with fidelity across settings and people. • builds an 'intervention bank' of research-based intervention ideas for common student academic and behavioral concerns. 	<p>Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> [B.3.2] Enlist Staff Cooperation. The RTI/MTSS Team has the authority and scope to enlist the</p>	<p>Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3</p>	



participation in the Tier 3 intervention plan of any educator who regularly interacts with the student.		
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.3.3] Access School-Wide Resources. The RTI/MTSS Team has inventoried and can access available resources within the school--including Tier 1 and 2 intervention programs and services--to include in any comprehensive, customized intervention plans that it creates. The Team also ensures that all elements of its interventions plans are 'evidence-based'-- i.e., supported by published research (Hawken, Vincent & Schumann, 2008).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.3.4] Serve as Resource Gatekeeper. The RTI/MTSS Team serves as gatekeeper when scarce social-emotional or behavioral resources are to be added to a student's RTI-B intervention plan--e.g., temporary assignment of a 1:1 Teaching Assistant; placement in a multi-week series of individual counseling sessions.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.3.5] Conduct FBAs/BIPs. The RTI/MTSS Team has the capacity to carry out Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBAs) and to use the resulting information to assemble Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) for students with the most intensive behavioral needs.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.3.6] Run 'Wrap-Around' Meetings. With parent agreement, the RTI/MTSS Team is prepared to invite to Problem-Solving Meetings staff from mental-health or other community agencies who work with the student. These joint discussions between school and community agencies are run as 'wrap-around' meetings, with the goal of creating a comprehensive intervention plan that coordinates school, home, and perhaps community support.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	

RTI/MTSS Behavior: School-Wide Screenings. Schools use an array of building-wide data and screening tools proactively to identify students with behavioral or social/emotional problems. These students can then be placed on appropriate classroom (Tier 1), early-intervention (Tier 2), or intensive-intervention (Tier 3) support plans.

RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.4.1] Develop a System for Archival Data Analysis. The school creates a process for analyzing building-wide archival data on attendance/tardiness and Office Disciplinary Referrals (ODRs) to identify students with significant concerns of behavior, social-emotional adjustment, and school engagement (Grosche & Volpe, 2013; McIntosh, Chard, Bolan, & Horner, 2006). This system includes:	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • periodic (e.g., every 5 weeks) compilation and review of school-wide attendance/tardiness and ODR data. • the setting of cut-points for each data source that will determine which students are at-risk. • creation of a matrix of routine RTI responses to match cut-points. This matrix directs the school to appropriate RTI interventions that correspond with the Tier 2 and Tier 3 cut-points for tardiness, absences, and ODRs. 		
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.4.2] Screen via Teacher Nomination. Up to 3 times per year, instructors use a 'multi-gating' structured process to identify students in their classrooms with significant behavioral or socio-emotional concerns (Grosche & Volpe, 2013).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	

RTI/MTSS-Behavior: District-Wide. The school district has adopted a process of planning and oversight to ensure that the RTI/MTSS-behavior model is implemented with fidelity and consistency across classrooms, grade levels, and schools.		
RTI/MTSS Element	Rating: How Important?	Discussion Notes
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.5.1] Write RTI/MTSS District Plan. The district has created a multi-year RTI/MTSS-behavior implementation plan to cover all schools.		
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.5.2] Establish District Leadership Team. The district has established an RTI/MTSS Leadership Team composed of central office and building representatives. This team meets periodically (e.g., every 4-8 weeks) to implement and update the district RT/MTSS-Behavior Plan, to ensure consistent implementation of RTI/MTSS across all schools, and to address challenges as they arise.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.5.3] Adopt an SEL Curriculum. The district uses a classroom/school-wide curriculum to teach and reinforce key Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) skills.	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	
<input type="checkbox"/> [B.5.4] Develop 'Non-Responder' Decision Rules. The district has developed decision rules to determine when a general-education student who has received a series of RTI/MTSS-behavior interventions is a 'non-responder' and requires referral to the special education eligibility team (CSE).	Low Priority High Priority 0.....1.....2.....3	

References

Bergan, J. R. (1995). Evolution of a problem-solving model of consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 6(2), 111-123.



- Burnett, P. C. (2001). Elementary students' preferences for teacher praise. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 36*(1), 16-23.
- Conroy, M. A., & Sutherland, K. S. (2012). Effective teachers for students with emotional/behavioral disorders: Active ingredients leading to positive teacher and student outcomes. *Beyond Behavior, 22*(1), 7-13.
- De Pry, R. L., & Sugai, G. (2002). The effect of active supervision and pre-correction on minor behavioral incidents in a sixth grade general education classroom. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 11*(4), 255-267.
- Eber, L., Sugai, G., Smith, C. R., & Scott, T. M. (2002). Wraparound and positive behavioral interventions and supports in the schools. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 10*(3), 171-180.
- Fairbanks, S., Sugai, G., Guardino, S., & Lathrop, M. (2007). Response to intervention: Examining classroom behavior support in second grade. *Exceptional Children, 73*, 288-310.
- Gansle, K. A., & Noell, G. H. (2007). The fundamental role of intervention implementation in assessing response to intervention. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *Response to intervention: The science and practice of assessment and intervention* (pp. 244-251). New York: Springer Publishing.
- Grosche, M., & Volpe, R. J. (2013). Response-to-intervention (RTI) as a model to facilitate inclusion for students with learning and behaviour problems. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 28*, 254-269.
- Hawken, L. S., Vincent, C. G., & Schumann, J. (2008). Response to intervention for social behavior: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 16*, 213-225.
- Leach, D., & Helf, S. (2016). Using a hierarchy of supportive consequences to address problem behaviors in the classroom. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 52*(1), 29-33.
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McIntosh, K., Chard, D. J., Bolan, J. B., & Horner, R. H. (2006). Demonstration of combined efforts in school-wide academic and behavioral systems and incidence of reading and behavior challenges in early elementary grades. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8*(3), 146-154.
- Mitchell, B. S., Stormont, M., & Gage, N. A. (2011). Tier two interventions implemented within the context of a tiered prevention network. *Behavioral Disorders, 36* (4), 241-261.
- Roach, A. T., & Elliott, S. N. (2008). Best practices in facilitating and evaluating intervention integrity. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp.195-208).
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. *Education and Treatment of Children, 31*(3), 351-380.
- Stormont, M., & Reinke, M. (2009). The importance of precorrective statements and behavior-specific praise and strategies to increase their use. *Beyond Behavior 18*(3), 26-32.