



Product Research & Documentation

Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart

Updated October 2016



Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart

A multi-tiered system of supports builds a framework of supports to benefit students and educators at all levels of instruction to assist every student. If students are having difficulties academically or behaviorally, then teachers can intervene early. Close attention is given to core instruction and to interventions, and progress monitoring data that is produced to measure the effectiveness of the instruction and interventions also help a student support team make informed decisions. Professional development is important so that teachers will know how to help students be successful and achieve. Collaboration among teachers, with the administrator ensuring that resources are available, is an important part of the multi-tiered approach. Supports must be in place to support identified students and teachers. Utilization of this approach is all about building support at every level to ensure student success. Different terms are used across the states when referring to multi-tiered systems of support. Some districts and states use the term MTSS while others use RTI, and still others use RTI2. All terms refer the provisions of instructional and intervention support for all students, yet there appear to be variation in the practices. According to the Center on Response to Intervention (2010), components of a multi-tiered system of supports are: multi-level screening, on-going progress monitoring, a multi-level prevention system and data-based decision making are the essential components. Success for students with disabilities and those who are at risk is dependent upon fidelity during the implementation of MTSS (Gerstein et al., 2012; Vaughn et al., 2015).

Mentoring Minds' Teacher Resources Product Development Team attended training sessions, webinars, studied the literature and available research, and held numerous collaborative discussions prior to developing the flip chart. The purpose of the product is to support a school in

the implementation of multi-tiered support system approach or to complement any existing Response to Intervention (RTI) or Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) process being initiated. The Multi-Tiered System of Supports teacher tool addresses the need for information about the RTI and PBIS processes presented in a simplified, easy-to-understand flip chart format. This flip chart assists teachers in implementing instructional and intervention supports in the classroom and provides teachers with evidence-based practices that meet the needs of all learners. The *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart* builds the knowledge base for RTI and PBIS for every teacher on a campus so that the faculty has a common language when discussing a multi-tiered approach. Suggestions for improving student performance, providing high-quality instruction, and implementing academic and or behavioral strategies at each of the tiers are among the hundreds of ideas included in this convenient teacher resource. The MTSS flip chart complements any existing academic and behavioral support processes.

As reported in a paper by the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (2005), the focus of Response to Intervention is on the accountability of the teaching and learning process in general education. A key component of RTI is early intervention at the first sign of academic and/or behavioral difficulties with the end result being the improvement in achievement of all students, including any students who may have a specific learning disability (SLD). The Council of Exceptional Children (CEC, 2006) recognized RTI as a special education initiative. CEC further notes that general education must lead the way in providing evidence-based instruction to all students and utilize research-based interventions with all struggling learners.

The intent of a multi-tiered approach is to provide a database for making instructional decisions for particular students. These identified students respond to evidence-based interventions in the RtI/PBIS process using a multi-tiered model. The responsiveness of students to such interventions provides a basis for determining the intensity and duration of additional instructional needs. The approach encourages schools to ensure that students receive a high level of instruction in the general education classroom followed by close monitoring of students' academic progress in that setting (IDEIA, 2004). RTI and PBIS focuses on strategies that are beneficial in delivering instruction needed to close learning gaps in a timely manner.

Research substantiates a number of reasons that lead to questioning or perhaps abandoning the use of the discrepancy model. As Torgesen et al. (2001) explained, "The IQ-discrepancy criterion is potentially harmful to students as it results in delaying intervention until the student's achievement is sufficiently low that the discrepancy is achieved. For most students, identification of having a specific learning disability (SLD) occurs at an age when the academic problems are difficult to remediate with the most intense remediation efforts." Donovan and Cross (2002) stated, ". . . the wait to fail model does not lead to closing the achievement gap for most students placed in special education. Many students placed in special education as SLD show minimal gains in achievement and few actually leave special education."

Due to the focus on accountability and assessment in the legislation of the No Child Left Behind Act, researchers Ernst, Miller, Robinson and Tilly (2005) noted how critical it is that appropriate evaluative measures and intervention practices be in place for students who are not performing at the expected standard. Marston, Muyskens, Lau, and Canter (2003) reported a positive finding on the use of RtI in Minneapolis Public Schools. This field research data shows a reduc-

tion in the number of African-American students referred for special education and a decrease in the number placed in special education over a four-year period. In addition, the most recent legislation, the Every Student Succeeds Act passed in December 2015, continued the emphasis on accountability and assessment with some changes. MTSS fulfills the vision expected by the ESSA legislation (Mandlawitz, 2016).

There are several reasons that justify a campus implementing the multi-tiered approach as developed by the Mentoring Minds team. Multi-tiered instruction and interventions were regarded by researchers Gresham (2002) and Marston (2001) as an alternative approach for identifying learning disabilities (LD) due to the concerns raised about the discrepancy model. Another reason this multi-tiered approach looks promising is that it is seen as a means to serve struggling learners earlier and provides a way to reduce referrals to special education by offering high-quality instruction and intensified intervention in general education. Researchers and practitioners have agreed that there is evidence to support a multi-tiered system as a means of monitoring the progress of students with or without disabilities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005, 2006; Marston, Muyskens, Lau, & Canter, 2003; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, & Hickman, 2003). Still another reason for the support of this approach centers on the research of reading. Numerous research studies by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000) and Lyon, et al. (2001) stated that early-identified students served by prevention programs can lead to a reduction in the number of students with reading problems by 70% and above.

All students need to develop the skill of reading. It is imperative that educators collaborate early on how to best teach all students to read. The application of high quality, effective instruction and evidence-based interventions seem likely to help achieve this goal. Research conducted through the National Institute of Child Health and Human



Development (NICHD) at universities throughout the country and reviewed by the National Reading Panel (2000) eliminated some long-held beliefs about reading and disabilities.

NICHD has found evidence to substantiate there are characteristics of early language that predict future reading and writing skills. Adams (1990) and Catts (1997) reported that studies which show 80% of preschool age children with language disorders later display some degree of reading difficulty. These researchers also reported that children who overcome early language difficulties before the age of five are not at risk. When children enter kindergarten, research reported that about 20% of them have significant difficulty learning to read.

The content of the *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart* stresses screening of all students followed by early identification and immediate intervention of students who are not achieving due to specific academic and/or behavior concerns. The instruction that is offered in grades K-3 has an effect on whether they continue to experience difficulties in reading or not. Children enter school with a variety of experiences, which affect the differences in skill level upon entry into kindergarten. Studies have shown that approximately 5% of students have absolutely no difficulties learning to read whereas about 60% find learning to read somewhat of a challenge. Approximately half of that 60% find learning to read extremely difficult (Lyon et al., 2001 as cited in Finn, Rotherham & Hokanson).

In the past, educators waited until second and sometimes third grade to provide intervention to students who exhibited reading difficulties. According to Fletcher, et al. (1994 as cited in Grosen, 1997), this practice results in about 74% of these students continuing to experience reading problems in ninth grade. Shaywitz, et. al. (1990),

found that boys and girls are equally likely to have reading problems. More boys are usually identified as having reading problems because it appears that teacher evaluations are sometimes influenced by gender. The *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart* provides the teacher with implementation support so students do not wait until failure to receive appropriate instruction and intervention.

The reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA) and ESSA advocated the use of interventions and instruction based on defensible research. Both required effective reading and behavior programs that result in improved student performance and fewer students needing special education services. Provisions of IDEA 2004 allow school districts to use scientific, research-based interventions as an alternative method for identifying students with SLD. The use of MTSS data is allowed as part of the special education referral or evaluation process. This law indicated that the use of other researched-based procedures is also permitted. Data collection should include functional academic and behavioral assessment measures, such as curriculum-based assessments and curriculum-based measures as part of student evaluations. These findings were recognized and incorporated into the development of the *Mutli-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart*.

The option is available for local education agencies to use up to 15% of IDEIA funds for students who need early interventions for academic and/or behavioral support to succeed in the general education setting but who have not been identified as needing special education support. Viable activities include professional development to deliver evidence-based interventions, services and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction. These kinds of experiences relate to MTSS and help to reduce the number

of students who might be placed in special education programs due to a lack of academic and/or behavioral success. The *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart* can be used as a driving force in staff development. Teachers can participate in discussion groups that focus on one or more tabbed sections.

Both the ESSA legislation (Mandlawitz, 2015) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004) focused on the quality of instruction received by students in the general education setting. IDEA 2004 and ESSA require the use of evidence-based instruction and interventions. The intent of the MTSS model is to change and place the identification process into the general education setting where a student receives evidence-based instruction. A multi-tiered system of interventions increasing in intensity and duration is needed to address the diverse needs of students. Effective reading and behavior programs that result in improved student performance have become an essential focus.

The literature has indicated that a tiered system of interventions is necessary to adjust the type and intensity of instruction in order to address the diversity of student needs (Kovaleski, 2003; Vaughn, 2003). Vaughn found that a tiered system demonstrates the flexibility to layer instruction over time and provides essential instruction early before a student lags too far behind. Kovaleski noted that several researchers suggested a three-tier model, yet models do exist that vary from three tiers or more. The *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart* does display a three-tiered model with multiple tiers to support academic and/or behavioral difficulties.

In determining the effectiveness of MTSS, it appears that all students can benefit when the instruction matches their current level of needs. Research based upon several studies by Mellard, Byrd, Johnson, Tollefson, and Boesche (2004) indicated that the RTI approach does benefit students who experience academic difficulties if the interventions are individualized and used

in a timely manner. Gresham (1989) stated that it is imperative that interventions be implemented with integrity, which means they must be closely monitored. However, evaluation of integrity can prove challenging due to time constraints in schools and teacher resistance (Gresham, 2001). Emerging research has seemed to show success implementing the RTI approach at Tiers 1 and 2 in the area of reading in elementary grades with some research on RTI and early mathematics and behavior.

Researchers Butler, et al. (2003), Cass, et al. (2003), and Mercer, Jordan, and Miller (1996) noted positive findings for students who received interventions in mathematics. The intervention used concrete–pictorial–abstract instruction until all lessons were taught or until each student achieved mastery. In the areas of computation, concepts and applications, and word problems, these studies indicated that students receiving targeted instruction outperformed those who were not identified for such. Fuchs et al. (2006) also found that RTI approach had a favorable impact on mathematics instruction for third graders. This study looked at the effects of a specific mathematics curriculum and how students were provided interventions at different tiers to improve their skills in problem solving.

At this time, little seems to be known about the effectiveness of RTI for other subject areas or for students in the upper grades, noted Mellard (2004). It has appears that few studies have focused on strategies for individualized interventions or the number of students who are identified for special education services (Fuchs, Mock, Morgan, & Young, 2003). Researchers have not seemed to agree on certain elements of the tiered process, such as the length of time for an intervention, the length of time an intervention plan is in use prior to evaluation (Gresham, 2001; Kovaleski, 2003), or the intensity of the intervention (Barnett, Daly, Jones & Lentz, 2004; Gresham, 2001).



Two RTI models are recognized from the studies: a standard protocol model and the problem-solving model. The standard protocol approach provides interventions to students who are grouped for shared needs because they experience common academic problems. This model calls for curriculum based assessments to be administered often, so that adjustments in instruction can be made by a campus team. Based on a student's response, instruction is continued, discontinued, or intensified (Kukic, Tilly, & Michelson, 2006). A longitudinal study, using the standard protocol model and conducted by Vellutino et al. (2006), revealed that early intervention resulted in significant reading improvement for at-risk students. In the latter model, a campus problem-solving team studies individual student data to make an informed decision about the need for interventions, identifies the interventions to use, and the amount of time for each (McCook, 2006). The Heartland Area Educational Agency in Iowa Public Schools implemented the problem-solving model. Tilly (2003) noted the importance of the scientific method in the decision-making process used at each tier. Grimes and Kurns (2003) indicated that teacher training is a part of Heartland's model and has shown to be essential in a multi-tiered approach.

The National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (2005) noted that both approaches utilize research-based interventions, progress monitoring, and fidelity and integrity control measures. No matter which model is chosen, the review of literature points to a multi-tiered model as a favorable approach for instruction and interventions.

Mellard, from the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities at the University of Kansas, found that most schools used RTI as a prevention model (2004). Mellard further explained that students received intense instruction in the

academic or behavioral areas as soon as data showed the student lagging behind peers. If after a predetermined period of time, the student continued to underachieve, a more intense instructional intervention was offered. Thus, a tiered model is designed to address under-achievement early and to individualize the problem and instruction to fit the student. Using RTI as a model for the identification of SLD does not appear to have broad application data at this time. Those who support the tiered-process approach have attested that multi-tiered assessments are sufficient for SLD determination. There appears to be little data on RTI models and their effectiveness in secondary schools. Researchers advocate that any well-designed model that requires assessment over time is an improvement over a single snapshot approach.

Marston (2001) reported a 40% decrease in special education placements for LD programs in Minneapolis public schools. This drop is likely due to the use of RTI to determine eligibility. Students appear to get the help needed in skill development with a three-tier model of prevention and intervention.

The learning styles section in the flip chart establishes a foundation from which to provide interventions or strategies for addressing individual needs. Teachers must make critical decisions in determining which interventions or strategies are most beneficial in delivering instruction to close learning gaps in a timely manner. In order to provide high-quality instruction, educators must understand how students learn. Knowing the students' preferences for learning helps to solidify the appropriate manner for successful implementation. Instruction and interventions which match students' strengths to targeted deficit areas have appeared to show favorable results in student performance.

Blackmore (1996) noted that teachers must recognize that there are different ways to learn, they must know their learners, and they must capitalize on the diversity of students to promote high standards in classroom performance. Educators have recognized for a long time that some students prefer a particular way to learn. Knowing this information helps teachers plan for small group and individualized instruction. Students who have knowledge of their own learning styles can better understand themselves in regards to strengths and areas for improvement. This knowledge might improve self-confidence when students acknowledge that their lack of learning might not be due to an inadequacy. Adey, Fairbrother, and William (1999) noted that self-knowledge of how one learns is an advantage.

Students are apt to get more from a learning experience when they understand and use their styles of learning. Sarasin (1998) suggested using the lesser-preferred styles of learning to help strengthen the scope of students' learning and to keep them in touch with how the real world functions. Pallapu (2007) found significant differences in a study of visual and verbal learners. The results appear to indicate that learning styles do affect learning and that improvement and learning increase if instruction accommodates the needs of learners. Dunn and Dunn (1998; 1992) stressed how important it is for teachers to work differently with different learners if learners are to perform their best. They emphasized that instruction is what increases achievement. Dunn and Dunn also noted the importance of educators receiving professional development on learning styles and its application. Strategies delineated in the Response to Intervention flip chart guide teachers in planning instruction and interventions relative to learning preferences of identified students.

Research indicates that teaching and learning improve with sound instructional practices. The section "Effective Instructional Practices" contains evidence-based strategies essential to any classroom environment that places student success as the driving force for teaching and learn-

ing. These practices are identified as: feedback, cooperative grouping, games/simulations, homework and practice, questions, and organizers. Strategies for each of the areas are described. Evidence has indicated that when teachers incorporate these strategies into instruction, teaching and learning improve.

Several findings have surfaced regarding homework and student practice of skills. Homework should match the appropriate instructional level of the student and provide practice on previously introduced skills (Rademacher, Deshler, Schumacher, & Lenz, 1998; Rosenberg, 1989). Newell and Rosenbloom (1981) and Anderson (1995) advocated that students must receive focused practice to achieve mastery of skills. Healy (1990) noted that it is recommended that students practice only a few skills at a time at a deeper level. Complicated tasks should be broken into smaller segments with built-in practice time, stated Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001).

Cooperative learning is regarded as a sound instructional practice. Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001) found that a significant effect on learning resulted when teachers grouped students in heterogeneous learning groups a minimum of once a week. Other research validated the use of cooperative learning for achievement, time on task, motivation to learn, and transfer of learning (Cohen, 1994; Johnson and Johnson, 1999).

Games and simulations promote high levels of engagement with immediate feedback and are beneficial to all students. Hood (1997) concluded that these experiences can motivate students intrinsically. Edelson (1998) shared that games can stimulate students to learn, assist them to discover concepts through exploration, and enable them to discover knowledge through exploration. Cooperation, teamwork, and conflict resolution are benefits of activities such as games and simulations, noted Neubecker (2003). Not only do such activities present opportunities for exploration and practice, but Dempsey, Casey, Haynes, and Lucassen (1994) found that chang-



es in attitude also surfaced. Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock (2001) shared that comprehension increases when students are given the opportunity to visualize and model concepts. Gordin and Pea (1995) stressed that classrooms which set up simulations and utilize modeling lay a strong foundation for the enrichment and extension of learning. Communication, problem solving, and collaboration are other skills students can accrue as a direct result of simulations, noted Gredler (1990; 1994).

Studies show that the art of asking questions with an emphasis on higher-level thinking can advance student achievement. Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001) reported how teachers can increase their effectiveness in teaching and learning by using research findings on questioning strategies. An important conclusion showed learning to increase in classrooms where teachers asked questions related to essential content rather than questions teachers believed would interest students (Alexander, Kulikowich, & Schulze, 1994; Risner, Nicholson, & Webb, 1994). Redfield and Rousseau (1981) reported that knowledge-level questions resulted in less learning than higher-level questions that encouraged students to use their analytical thought processes. Fillippone (1998) found that teachers ask lower-level questions more times than not.

Wait-time should be acknowledged before and after asking a question. Usually teachers give less than one second for students to respond to a question, and the results are short responses or no response at all. Student-to-student interaction and quality of responses increase when wait-time is addressed, noted Fowler (1975). Rowe (1974) studied the effect of questions used by teachers on elementary students. Results showed that three to five seconds of wait-time led to increases in student responses, student

confidence, evidence supporting the response, and student conversation. This finding is consistent at the middle and high school levels when wait-time is allowed after asking a question. A recommendation is to allow five seconds of wait-time. Students must be informed that this time is their think-time, and time should also be adjusted to the cognitive level of the questions.

Organizers prepare students for learning, develop and reinforce the concept, and help clarify misunderstandings. Many researchers have supported the use of organizers for reading skills and vocabulary development (Brookbank, Grover, Kullberg, & Strawser, 1999; Moore & Readence, 1984). Graphic organizers allow students to use graphics, symbols, and words to present a visual display to structure learning before and during a lesson. Paivio (1986) stated that students can understand information better and learn more when a variety of modes are used to present content.

Another effective instructional practice noted in the flip chart is feedback. When feedback denotes where and why students have made errors, it seems that significant increases in student learning result (Lysakowski & Walberg, 1982; Tennenbaum & Goldring, 1989; Walberg, 1999). One of the most important practices used to improve student achievement is student feedback, according to Hattie (1992). Walberg (1999) also reported that the level of achievement varies depending on the type of teacher feedback a student receives. Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001) recommended that students remain involved on a task until the standard is reached if achievement is to be enhanced. An emphasis on timely feedback appears to affect the degree of value for learning, noted Bangert-Downs, Kulik, and Morgan (1991).

The need for higher-quality assessments has been well established, which led to “Assess-

ments” as an area to address in the flip chart. Studies have shown that teachers spend as much as one-third to one-half of their time involved in assessment-related activities (Stiggins & Conklin, 1992). For instruction to be effective, classroom assessments must reflect quality. Assessment strategies provide measures to make an evaluative judgment of students’ levels of competencies in given areas. This judgment determines the educational needs of students and offers direction to the teacher in planning effective instruction. Assessments should be both informal and formal. These varied assessments should be utilized before, during, and after instruction.

The information derived from assessments is a powerful tool to monitor the development of student understanding, to revise instruction, and to provide reflection for learners. It is noted that effective teachers utilize assessment tasks as quality learning experiences (NRC, 1996). Assessment feedback supplies the learner with self-assessment information, but it also enhances motivation, which is crucial to achievement. Learning improves with consistent feedback (Heath & Glen, 2005; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002).

Rubrics provide students with established informative criteria for success by clarifying desired learning outcomes for students. Crooks (1988) shared that criterion-referenced feedback provides the guidance for improving student understanding. Self-assessment and reflection are important due to the feedback students can ascertain for themselves. Effective learning appears to result from students who provide their own feedback by monitoring their work against preset criteria presented to them in advance of the work task or assignment (Trammel, Schloss, & Alper, 1994; Wiggins, 1993).

Mentoring Minds acknowledged differentiation as another viable section for inclusion in this valuable educator’s tool. Differentiation is a classroom practice that engages all learners by addressing their interests, their learning profiles, and their readiness levels. Differentiated instruc-

tion occurs in the curriculum, in lessons, and in assessments. Tomlinson (2001) and Roberts and Inman (2007) shared that differentiation addresses variance in content, process, and product. Tomlinson stated that this approach is “responsive” teaching rather than planning instruction that reflects a “one-size-fits-all” approach. Differentiation is delivered to help all students, no matter what age, learn as efficiently as possible (Tomlinson, 2003a). Improved achievement is promoted when teachers are attentive to students’ preferences of learning. Tomlinson (2003) reported that student motivation and student attention to tasks increase when the topics of study reflect personal interests of students.

Roberts and Inman (2007) revealed that planning is meaningful and purposeful. Instructional options are not offered merely to provide students with choices in learning modalities or studies of interests. Teachers must intentionally offer choices in content, activities, assessments, products, and group formats that match the learning experience directly to the learner. As a result, student motivation increases. Student behavior can often improve when choices are allowed. Strategies for differentiating instruction are noted. Implementation of differentiation is not easy, and teacher support through training opportunities and coaching is recommended. This practice is a valuable one to help campuses reach and sustain high standards within all classrooms.

An area of high importance in MTSS is behavioral support, or PBIS. When misbehavior interrupts learning, it can have a negative impact on the students and teachers. Valuable instructional time can be lost, the day-to-day functioning of the classroom can be changed, and the campus climate can be one of fear. One study (Homer et al., 2009) showed successful implementation of school-wide practices for positive behavior strategies for Tier 1. Improved perceptions of school safety were noted. Thus, strategies and information regarding the behavioral domain are addressed in the *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart*. Other PBIS findings are noted that



show school-wide behavioral support and aligned classroom support practices, but the research is in press so it will be reported when available. It appears that evidence-based findings from SWIS and PBIS implementation can make a difference, reducing behavioral situations.

Research has revealed that the teacher is likely the most important factor affecting student achievement (Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997). This finding, a result of a study involving approximately 60,000 students, clearly implies that education can be improved by improving the effectiveness of teachers. Haycock (1998) studied this research and that of others, leading her to share that differences in student achievement existed between students placed with a highly effective teacher and those placed with a highly ineffective teacher.

Effective teachers must model, teach, demonstrate, and allow students to practice the precise behaviors they expect. Using an approach that includes a variety of communication techniques facilitates the success of all types of learners, as they comprehend the “how” of what is expected. Numerous studies were conducted to determine the value of teaching students using their preferred learning styles (Dunn, Griggs, Olson, Beasley, & Gorman, 1995). The findings revealed that educational interventions that were matched to the learning styles of the students would favorably influence student achievement.

Emmer, Sanford, Clements, and Martin (1983), using an analysis of several studies, indicated that teachers should involve students actively in instructional activities. Furthermore, these researchers noted that teachers, who display poor management, mismanage class time and prevent valuable time on task for students. Thus, the strategies in the MTSS resource includes classroom management, transitions, environment, and time management as areas to address.

One study noted that teachers who effectively manage their classrooms use different strategies with various types of students, whereas the same strategies appeared to be used for various situations by ineffective classroom managers. A recommendation from this study by Brophy (1996) was to develop strategies for teachers to use with students in specific situations called “helping skills.” These skills target misbehaviors and provide guidance on how to handle students who exhibit inappropriate behaviors.

For the first 16 years of its 22 years of existence, discipline was identified as the top problem in the Annual Gallup Poll of the Public’s Attitudes Toward the Public Schools findings. The Phi Delta Kappa 38th Annual Gallup Poll (Rose & Gallup, 2006) reported discipline as a continued problem cited by respondents, but financial support and overcrowded schools rank above discipline as problems in the nation’s educational system. The 29th Annual Gallup Poll of Teachers’ Attitudes (Rose & Gallup, 1997) noted a lack of discipline was one of two problems most frequently pointed out by the survey respondents.

A study by Tulley and Chiu (1995) identified the fact that 91% of discipline problems experienced by student teachers involved defiance, inattention, and disruption. The most effective strategies used were positive reinforcement, explanation, and change of strategy (e.g., pausing, moving closer, changing the volume of voice). In findings shared by researchers (Braithwaite, 2001; Fisher, et al. 1991; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 1995; Walker & Walker, 1991), general education teachers need interventions they can implement effectively in the regular classroom and in small groups to help students manage their social interactions. Such findings are reflected in the *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart*.

Brophy (1988), in his review of research on the implication of teaching for low-achieving students,

concluded that the key to achievement gain was maximizing the time teachers actively engaged the students no matter if they were in regular or special education classrooms. Thus, time-management strategies are referenced in the tiers addressing the behavioral domains.

In studying well-disciplined schools, Short (1988) indicated a student-centered environment which includes students and teachers problem solving together. In addition, the incorporation of activities to promote the self-esteem of students and activities that lead a student to feel a sense of belonging are more effective in decreasing behavior problems as opposed to punishment consequences. The philosophy adhered to in the flip chart demonstrates collaborative and supportive efforts leading to students becoming self-disciplined to manage their own behaviors. The *Multi-Tiered System of Support Flip Chart* provides extensive direction for educators, new and experienced, to establish a solid foundation for school success, to use strategies to reduce disciplinary interruptions, and to follow through with effectively used interventions.

Marzano, Marzano, and Pickering (2003) reviewed over 100 studies on classroom management to determine the effects on student achievement. The analysis revealed many findings. One major finding revealed that individual teachers do affect student achievement. This MTSS resource can become the focus of an ongoing school-wide campus study where teachers and student-support teams seek to create an environment where teaching can flourish. Well-managed classrooms do not appear magically, as it takes effort and commitment from every teacher to create effective classrooms on a school-wide level. Studies indicate that teachers can learn how to change student behaviors and focus them in a more positive direction.

This flip chart is a resource which can assist all staff as they differentiate the needed strategies to accommodate student learning. An understanding of and use of specific strategies for effective classroom management can adjust

the potential level of teachers and students. Research shows that training can change teacher behavior and lead to improved student behavior which affects student achievement favorably. A campus should work collaboratively to increase school performance. "A sustained effort to improve teaching and instruction will likely also result in reducing problem student behaviors," the Educational Testing Service noted in its 1998 policy report, *Order in the Classroom*. As the ETS (1998) explained, "Better teaching, better behavior, and higher achievement are intertwined."

Federal laws ESSA and IDEA (2004) direct schools to focus on helping all students learn by addressing academic and/or behavioral concerns earlier. Both federal laws declare the importance of high quality, scientifically based instruction interventions. Both hold schools accountable for the progress of all students in meeting grade level standards. The Mentoring Minds Teacher Resources Team considered the directives from both laws, the literature on effective strategies, and findings from studies on the areas cited in the flip chart to determine the included strategies.

Mentoring Minds developed the *Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart* to provide educators with a tool to address multi-tiered intervention implementation. This product helps educators understand and apply the process of early identification for students who are experiencing difficulty in academic and/or behavioral domains.

Contents of the flip chart include pertinent RTI and PBIS information, a descriptive overview of each of the three tiers, suggestions for differentiating instruction, addressing learning styles, grouping for instruction, assessing student learning, promoting a quality-learning environment, and implementing effective instructional practices. Strategies in other related areas help teachers deliver instruction and/or interventions to help students achieve academic success in all settings. Numerous suggestions for developing, reinforcing, or extending general classroom instruction are also offered.



Instructional and intervention strategies are identified within the three academic and behavioral tabbed sections for each tier. The number coding, following each bulleted strategy, allows for easy documentation or discussion of a targeted strategy. A visual representation of the MTSS model is offered on the back of the flip chart. This model is a framework for understanding the delivery of multi-tiered instruction in the academic and/or behavioral domains and for ensuring student success. A notable value of the flip chart is to build or extend the background knowledge of teachers on strategies that research has identified as important to effective instruction. Schools who utilize the *Response to Intervention Strategies* flip chart are provided a resource with which to reach favorable academic results for their students.

Bibliography for the Multi-Tiered System of Supports Flip Chart

- Adams, M. A. (1990). *Beginning reading instruction in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.
- Adey, P., Fairbrother, R., & William, D. (1999). *Learning styles and strategies: a review of research*. London: King's College.
- Alexander, P., Kulikowich, J., & Schulze, S. (1994). How subject-matter knowledge affects recall and interest. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 313–37.
- Anderson, J. R. (1995). *Learning and memory: An integrated approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bambara, L., & Kern, K. (2005). *Individualized supports for students with problem behaviors: Designing positive behavior plans*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bangert-Downs, R., Kulik, C., Kulik, J., & Morgan, M. (1991). The instructional effects of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 213–38. Retrieved from <http://www.bank-street.edu/tne/domains.html>
- Barnett, D., Daly, E., Jones, K., & Lentz, F. (2004). Response to intervention: Empirically based special service decisions from single-case designs of increasing and decreasing intensity. *Journal of Special Education*, 38(2), 66–79.
- Barton, P. E., Coley, R. J., & Wenglinsky, H. (1998). *Order in the classroom: Violence, discipline, and student achievement*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Batsche, G., Elliott, J., Graden, J., Grimes, J., Kovalski, J., Prasse, D., Reschly, D., Schrag, J., & Tilly, W. D. (2006). *Response to intervention: Policy considerations and implementation* (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc.
- Bergan, J. (1977). *Behavioral consultation*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Blackmore, J. (1996). *Pedagogy: Learning styles*. Retrieved from <http://granite.cyg.net/~jblackmo/diglib/styl-a.html>
- Braithwaite, R. (2001). *Managing aggression*. New York: Routledge.
- Brookbank, D., Grover, S., Kullberg, K., & Strawser, C. (1999). *Improving student achievement through organization of student learning*. Chicago: Saint Xavier University and IRI/Skylight. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 435094).
- Brophy, J. (1996). *Working with shy or withdrawn students*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 402070).

- Burns, M., & Gibbons, K. (2008). *Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, F., Miller, S., Crehan, K., Babbitt, B., & Pierce, T. (2003). Fraction instruction for students with mathematics disabilities: Comparing two teaching sequences. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(2), 99–111.
- Cass, M., Cates, D., Smith, M., & Jackson, C. (2003). Effects of manipulative instruction on solving area and perimeter problems by students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*(2), 112–20.
- Catts, H. (1997). The early identification of language-based reading disabilities. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 28*(1), 86–89.
- Cohen, E. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cortiella, C. (2005). *A parent's guide to response-to-intervention (Parent Advocacy Brief)*. New York: National Center for Learning Disabilities. Retrieved from http://www.nclld.org/images/stories/downloads/parent_center/rti_final.pdf.
- Council for Exceptional Children (2006). *Response to intervention – The promise and the peril*. Retrieved from <http://www.cec.sped.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisp>
- Crooks, T. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research, 58*(4), 438–81.
- Dempsey, J., Rasmussen, K., & Lucassen, B. (1994). Instructional gaming: Implications for instructional technology. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Nashville, TN.
- Donovan, M., & Cross, C. (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10128>.
- Duffy, H. (2007). *Meeting the needs of significantly struggling learners in high school: A look at approaches to tiered intervention*. Washington, D.C.: National High School Center. Retrieved from http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/NHSC_RTIBrief_08-02-07.pdf
- Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1992). *Teaching elementary students through their individual learning styles*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1998). *The complete guide to the learning styles inservice system*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Dunn, R., Griggs, S., Olson, J., Beasley, M., & Gorman, B. (1995). A meta-analytic validation of the Dunn and Dunn model of learning-style preferences. *The Journal of Educational Research, 88*(6), 353–62.
- Edelson, D. (1998). Matching the design of activities to the affordances of software to support inquiry-based learning. *Proceedings of the International Conference of the Learning Sciences* (pp. 77–83). Retrieved from http://www.worldwatcher.northwestern.edu/userdownloads/pdf/Edelson_ics98.pdf
- Emmer, E., Sanford, J., Clements, B., & Martin, J. (1983). Improving junior high classroom management. Paper presented at annual American Educational Research Association, Montreal: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 234032).
- Ernst, L., Miller, B., Robinson, W., & Tilly, W. (2005). Response to intervention: A case illustration, presented at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, November 9, 2005.
- Fillippone, M. (1998). Questioning at the elementary level. Master's thesis, Kean University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 417421).
- Fisher R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (2nd ed.). New York: Penguin.



Fletcher, J., Shaywitz, S., Shankweiler, D., Katz, L., Liberman, L., Stuebing, K., Francis, D., Fowler, A., & Shaywitz, B. (1994). Cognitive profiles of reading disability: Comparisons of discrepancy and low achievement definitions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(1), 6–23.

Fowler, T. (1975). An investigation of the teacher behavior of wait-time during an inquiry science lesson. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 108872).

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (2005). Responsiveness-to-intervention: A blueprint for practitioners, policymakers, and parents. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 38*(1), 57–61.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (2006). Introduction to Response to Intervention: What, why, and how valid is it? *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(1), 93–98.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., & Vaughn S. (2008). *Response to intervention: A Framework for educators*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C., Hope, S., Hollenbeck, K., & Capizzi, A. (2006). Extending responsiveness-to-intervention to math problem solving at third grade. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 31*(1), 70–73.

Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P., & Young, C. (2003). Responsiveness-to-intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for learning disabilities construct. *Learning Disabilities: Research and Practice, 18*(3), 157–71.

Gallegos, E. (2006). School reform through response to intervention. Paper presented at Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association, Austin, TX.

Gersten, R., Clarke, B., Jordan, N., Newman-Gonchar, R., Haymond, K., & Wilkins, C. (2012). Universal screening in mathematics for the primary grades: Beginnings of a research base. *Exceptional Children, 78*(4), 423–45.

Gordin, D., & Pea, R. (1995). Prospects for visualization as an educational technology. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 4*(3), 249–79.

Gredler, M. (1990). Analyzing deep structure in games and simulations. *Simulations & Games for Learning, 20*(3), 329–34.

Gredler, M. (1994). *Designing and evaluating games and simulations: A process approach*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.

Gresham, F. (1989). Assessment of treatment integrity in school consultation and prereferral intervention. *School Psychology Review, 18*, 37–50.

Gresham, F. (2001). Responsiveness to intervention: An alternative approach to the identification of learning disabilities. Paper presented at the Learning Disabilities Summit, Washington, D.C.

Gresham, F. (2002). Responsiveness to intervention: An alternative approach to the identification of learning disabilities. In R. Bradley, L. Danielson, & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), *Identification of learning disabilities: Research to practice* (pp. 467–519). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grimes, J., & Kurns, S. (2003). An intervention-based system for addressing NCLB and IDEA expectations: A multiple tiered model to ensure every child learns. Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO.

- Grossen, B. (1997). *30 years of research: What we know about how children learn to read (A synthesis of research on reading from the National Institute of Child Health and Development)*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Hattie, J. (1992). Enhancing self-concept. In J. Hattie. *Self-concept*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Haycock, K. (1998). Good teaching matters: How well-qualified teachers can close the gap. *Thinking K-16*, 3(2), n2.
- Healy, J. (1990). *Endangered minds: Why our children don't think*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Heath, N., & Glen, T. (2005). Positive illusory bias and the self-protective hypothesis in children with learning disabilities. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* 34(2): 272–82.
- Homer, R., Sugai, G., Smolkowski, K., Todd, A., Nakasato, J., & Esperanza, J. (2009). A randomized control trial of school-wide positive behavior support in elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(3), 113–44.
- Hood, P. (1997). Simulation as a tool in education research and development. Paper presented for EdTalk, Washington, D.C.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004). PL 108–446, 20 U.S.C. §§1400 et seq.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kern, L., Choutka, C., & Sokol, N. (2002). Assessment-based antecedent interventions used in natural settings to reduce challenging behavior: An analysis of the literature. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 25(1), 113–30.
- Kovaleski, J. (2003). The three-tier model for identifying learning disabilities: Critical program features and system issues. Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO.
- Kukic, S., Tilly, D., & Michelson, L. (2006). *Addressing the needs of students with learning difficulties through the Response to Intervention (RtI) strategies*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.nasdse.org/publications.cfm>
- Linnenbrink, E., & Pintrich, P. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review*, 31(3), 313–27.
- Lyon, G., Fletcher, J., Shaywitz, S., Shaywitz, B., Torgesen, J., Wood, F., Schulte, A., & Olson, R. (2001). Rethinking learning disabilities. In C. E. Finn Jr., A. J. Rotherham, & C. R. Hokanson Jr. (Eds.), *Rethinking special education for a new century* (pp. 259–287). Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.ppionline.org/documents/SpecialEd_complete_volume.pdf.
- Lysakowski, R., & Walberg, H. (1981). Classroom reinforcement and learning: A quantitative synthesis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75(2), 69–77.
- Mandlawitz, M. R. (2016). *Every Student Succeeds Act: Summary of Key Provisions*. Retrieved from [http://www.casecec.org/legislative/Every%20Student%20Succeeds%20Act_CASE%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.casecec.org/legislative/Every%20Student%20Succeeds%20Act_CASE%20(2).pdf)
- Marston, D. (2001). A functional and intervention-based assessment approach to establishing discrepancy for students with learning disabilities. Paper presented at the LD Summit, Washington, D.C.
- Marston, D., Muyskens, P., Lau, M., & Canter, A. (2003). Intervention model for decision making with high-incidence disabilities: The Minneapolis experience. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 18(3), 187–200.
- Marzano, R., Marzano, J., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Researched-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.



Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCook, J. (2006). *The Rtl guide: Developing and implementing a model in your schools*. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.

Mellard, D., & Johnson, E. (2008). *RTI: A Practitioner's guide to implementing response to intervention*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Mellard, D. (2004). Basic Principles of the Responsiveness-to-Intervention Approach. Retrieved from <http://www.schwablearning.org/articles.asp?r=1056>

Mellard, D., Byrd, S., Johnson, E., Tollefson, J., & Boesche, L. (2004). Foundations and research on identifying model responsiveness-to-intervention sites. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 27(4), 243–56.

Mercer, C., Jordan, L., & Miller, S. (1996). Constructivistic math instruction for diverse learners. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 11(3), 147–56.

Moore, D., & Readence, J. (1984). A quantitative and qualitative review of graphic organizer research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 78(1), 11–17.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (2006). NASDSE explains response to intervention as published in FOCUS on Results document. Focus on Results, 7(2), 1–12. Retrieved from www.cenmi.org

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (2005). Response to intervention: Policy considerations and implementation. Retrieved from www.nasdse.org

National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (2005). Responsiveness to intervention and learning disabilities. Retrieved from www.idonline.org/njcd.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Retrieved from <https://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/Documents/report.pdf>

National Research Center on Learning Disabilities (2005). *Core concepts of Rtl*. Retrieved from www.nrcld.org

National Research Council (1996). *National science education standards*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Neubecker, M. (2003) Simulation as an instructional tool. In *Encyclopedia of Educational Technology*. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University. Retrieved from <http://coe.sdsu.edu/eet/articles/simulations/index>

Newell, A., & Rosenbloom, P. S. (1981). Mechanisms of skill acquisition and the law of practice. In J. R. Anderson (Ed.), *Cognitive skills and their acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

No Child Left Behind (2001). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Paivio, A. (1986). *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pallapu, P. (2007). Effects of visual and verbal learning styles on learning. *Institute of Learning Styles Research Journal*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.auburn.edu/>

- Pintrich, P., & Schunk, D. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rademacher, J., Deshler, D., Schumacher, J., & Lenz, B. (1998). *The quality assignment routine*. Lawrence, KS: Edge Enterprises, Inc.
- Redfield, D., & Rousseau, E. (1981). A meta-analysis of experimental research on teacher questioning behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(2), 237–45.
- Risner, G., Nicholson, J., & Webb, B. (1994). *Levels of comprehension promoted by the Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) Program*. Florence: University of North Alabama. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 381751)
- Roberts, J., & Inman, T. (2007). *Strategies for differentiating instruction*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press Inc.
- Rose, L., & Gallup, A. (2006). The 38th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. *Phi Delta Kappa, 88*(1), 41–53.
- Rose, L. & Gallup, A. (1997). The 29th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. *Phi Delta Kappa, 79*, 41–53.
- Rosenberg, M. (1989). The effects of daily homework assignments on the acquisition of basic skills by students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22*(5), 314–22.
- Rowe, M. (1974). Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic, and fate control: Part one—wait-time. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11*(2), 81–94.
- Sarasin, L. (1998). *Learning style perspectives: Impact in the classroom*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.
- Shaywitz, S., Shaywitz, B., Fletcher, J., & Escobar, M. (1990). Prevalence of reading disability in boys and girls: Results of the Connecticut Longitudinal Study. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 264*(8), 998–1002.
- Short, P. (1988). Effectively disciplined schools: three themes from research. *NASSP Bulletin, 72*(504), 1–3.
- Stiggins, R., & Conklin, N. (1992). *In teachers' hands: Investigating the practice of classroom assessment*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Tenenbaum, G., & Goldring, E. (Spring, 1989). A meta-analysis of the effect of enhanced instruction: Cues, participation, reinforcement and feedback, and correctives on motor skill learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22*(3), 53–64.
- Tilley, W. (2003). How many tiers are needed for successful prevention and early intervention? Heartland Area Education Agency's evolution from four to three tiers. Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO.
- Tomlinson, C. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum and Supervision Development.
- Tomlinson, C. (2003). *Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom: Strategies and Tools for Responsive Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. (2003a). Differentiating instruction for academic diversity. In J. M. Cooper (Ed.), *Classroom teaching skills, 7th Ed.* (pp. 149–180). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Torgeson, J., Alexander, A., Wagner, R., Rashotte, C., Voeller, K., & Conroy, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with reading disabilities immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*(1), 33–58, 78.



Trammel, D., Schloss, P., & Alper, S. (1994). Using self-recording and graphing to increase completion of homework assignments. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27*(2), 75–81.

Tulley, M., & Chiu, L. (1995). Student teachers and classroom discipline. *The Journal of Educational Research, 88*(3), 164–71.

Vaughn, S. (2003). How many tiers are needed for response to intervention to achieve acceptable prevention outcomes? Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO. Retrieved from <http://www.nrcld.org>.

Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., & Hickman, P. (2003). Response to treatment as a means of identifying students with reading/learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 69*(4), 391–409.

Vaughn, S., Roberts, G., Swanson, E. A., Wanzek, J., Fall, A. M., & Stillman-Spisak, S. J. (2015). Improving middle-school students' knowledge and comprehension in social studies: A replication. *Educational Psychology Review, 27*(1), 31–50.

Vellutino, F., Scanlon, D., Small, S., & Fanuele, D. (2006). Response to intervention as a vehicle for distinguishing between children with and without reading disabilities: Evidence for the role of kindergarten and first-grade interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39*(2), 157–69.

Walberg, H. (1999). Productive teaching. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *New directions for teaching practice and research* (pp. 75–104). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Corporation.

Walker, H., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Walker, H., & Walker, J. (1991). *Coping with non-compliance in the classroom: A positive approach for teachers*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed, Inc.

Wiggins, G. (1993). *Assessing student performances: Exploring the purpose and limits of testing*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wright, S., Horn, S., & Sanders, W. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 11*(1), 57–67.

MentoringMinds[®]
Critical Thinking for Life![™]

P.O. Box 8843 • Tyler, TX 75711
800.585.5258 • mentoring**minds**.com