

AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is made as of the 8 day of March, 2016
by and between Kenmore- Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District, having an address of 1500
Colvin Boulevard, Tonawanda, New York 14223 (the "District") and Intervention Central: RTI
Consultation & Training, having an address of 364 Long Road, Tully, NY 13159
(hereinafter called the "Provider").

*James
Wright
dba*

FOR GOOD AND VALUABLE CONSIDERATION, the sufficiency of which is hereby
acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

1. Provision of Services. Provider agrees to provide the District with the services set forth on Schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof (the "Services"). To the extent requested by the District, the Services will be provided by the Provider at such time and location as are determined by the District.
2. Payment for Services. The District shall pay the Provider compensation and/or fees as set forth on Schedule B for the performance of the Services.
3. Term/Termination. The term of this Agreement shall be from April 2016
through August 2016 ("Term"). The District may terminate this Agreement by giving ten
(10) days prior written notice to the Provider, and if this Agreement is terminated, no compensation will be
due under paragraph 2 of this Agreement for services that were to be rendered during the period
following the termination date.
4. Non-Assignability. No party shall assign, transfer or otherwise dispose of its rights or
obligations under this Agreement, in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of the other party.
5. Indemnification. Provider shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the District, its Board of
Education, officers, administrators, employees, agents and representatives from and against all claims,
demands, causes of action, liabilities, losses, damages, judgments, penalties, costs and expenses
(including reasonable attorney fees) arising out of the negligent or intentional acts or omissions of
Provider, its officers, employees, agents and representatives.
6. Insurance. During the term of this Agreement, Provider shall maintain at its own expense:
 - (i) a commercial general liability policy, including contractual liability coverage, in
amounts of 2 million dollars per occurrence, 2 million dollars aggregate, in occurrence
coverage form, naming the District as an additional insured. The District shall be an
additional insured by ISO additional insured endorsement CG 20 26 or equivalent.
 - (ii) Workers' Compensation and New York State Disability Benefits coverage on all
representatives of Provider providing services under this Agreement.
 - (iii) professional liability coverage for each of Provider's employees providing services
under this Agreement, in amounts of 2 million dollars per occurrence, 2 million dollars
aggregate. In the event that the professional liability policy is a claims made policy,
Provider shall purchase a "tail" policy for a period of no less than five (5) years from the
termination date of the foregoing policy. Said "tail" policy shall have policy limits in an
amount not less than the primary professional liability policy.
 - (iv) any other insurance legally required to protect its employees, agents, independent
contractors, and representatives in the performance of their duties under this Agreement.

(13)

(v) all insurance policies shall be with an insurance company acceptable to the District and additional insured endorsements shall be on a primary and non-contributory basis.

Provider shall provide the District with certificates of insurance regarding all such coverage, which will provide for 30 days advance written notice to the District prior to any cancellation, non-renewal or material modification of coverage.

7. Amendment. This Agreement shall not be amended, changed, or modified in any manner except by an instrument in writing signed by a duly authorized representative of each of the parties hereto.

8. Relationship Between The Parties. The parties are independent contractors under this Agreement. Neither party shall have the authority to commit the other party to any binding obligation or to execute, on behalf of the other party, any agreement or other document creating legal obligations on the part of the other party, and neither party shall represent to any third party that it has any such authority. Provider, as an independent contractor, and Provider's personnel, shall not be considered employees of the District for any purpose. Provider is solely responsible for scheduling, directing and completing the work and for furnishing all equipment, materials, supplies, personnel, and other resources necessary to perform the work. Under no circumstances will Provider or its personnel be eligible or allowed to receive or participate in any benefit available to the District's employees. Provider will be responsible for any federal income taxes due that may be associated with the fee paid to Provider pursuant to this Agreement.

9. Miscellaneous

- a. Provider shall comply with all federal, state and local laws, rules and regulations that apply to the performance of the work.
- b. Provider represents that it (i) possesses all of the licenses, certifications and permits necessary to perform the work, and (ii) is fully qualified by training and experience to perform the work.
- c. Section 2-d of the New York State Education Law requires that a Parents Bill of Rights for data privacy and security must be included with every contract an educational agency enters into with a third party contractor, where the third party contractor receives student data or teacher or principal data. Accordingly, this Agreement is deemed to incorporate by reference the District's Parents Bill of rights for data privacy and security (*see District's website – www.kenton.k12.ny.us*). The Contractor agrees to comply with all applicable provisions of Section 2-d of the Education Law, any rules and regulations of the New York State Education Department issued thereunder, and the District's Parents Bill of Rights for data privacy and security, including any amendments to any of these.
- d. If Provider's personnel are to work with the District's students directly, all such personnel shall receive background checks through State Education procedures, if and as required by law. Proof of State Education Department clearance shall be provided prior to provision of services to the students.
- e. This Agreement shall be governed by and be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of New York, disputes shall be venued in a court of competent jurisdiction in Erie County, New York, and the parties hereby consent to personal jurisdiction in any such court.
- f. This written Agreement, including the attached Schedules, contains the entire agreement between the parties. There are no other agreements or understandings concerning the terms of this Agreement.
- g. In the event of conflict between Sections 1 through 9 of this Agreement and the attached Schedules, the provisions of Sections 1 through 9 of this Agreement shall prevail.

- h. This Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to benefit the executors, administrators, heirs, successors and assigns of the respective parties.
- i. Whenever any notice is to be given pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, such notice shall be in writing and shall be considered given when (i) delivered personally, or (ii) sent by commercial overnight courier with written confirmation of delivery, or (iii) when delivered by United States mail, postage prepaid, certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to the location below, or other location as has been designated by notice in accordance with this Agreement:

The District: Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District
1500 Colvin Boulevard
Buffalo, New York 14223

Attention: Assistant Superintendent for Finance

Provider: Intervention Central: RTI Consultation & Training
364 Long Road
Tully, NY 13159

Attention: Jim Wright

The parties' consent to this Agreement is indicated by their signatures below.

KENMORE-TOWN OF TONAWANDA
UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT

BY: _____

Authorized Signatory

[Jim Wright]

BY: _____

Authorized Signatory

28 March 2016

SCHEDULE B

(Compensation/Fees)

SEE ATTACHED



Intervention Central: RTI Consultation & Training
364 Long Road
Tully, NY 13159

16 February 2016

Robin Zymroz
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction & Student Services
Kenmore - Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District
Department of Student Services
1500 Colvin Boulevard
Buffalo, NY 14223

Robin:

Thank you for contacting me to discuss the possibility of my providing Response-to-Intervention consultation and training services to the Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District ("Ken-Ton UFSD") over the next several months.

Based on the guidance that I received when you, Heather Lyon, Catherine Huber, and I participated in a phone conference on 3 February 2016, I have written the accompanying proposal outlining a 3-stage RTI consultation and training initiative. The proposal begins with an audit to map out current RTI practices in your district; moves to the provision of RTI training to targeted staff; and concludes with a session to build a multi-year plan to guide Ken-Ton UFSD in its RTI roll-out efforts.

As outlined here, the entire proposal includes 8 days of onsite consultation/training (3 days to conduct the RTI audit; 4 days for staff development; and 1 day for developing an RTI implementation plan). In accordance with your wishes, I have projected all work being completed by the end of August 2016 to build momentum to move RTI forward in your schools in the coming year.

My standard daily rate in working with school districts is \$2000--plus travel expenses (mileage and lodging only) from my home near Syracuse, NY, to your district. Alternatively, I offer the option of folding the presentation fee and all travel expenses into a fixed daily rate of \$2300 if that is more convenient. Using the \$2300 inclusive daily rate, the 8 days of this proposal would cost \$18,400.

Of course, this proposal is a draft only and is open for discussion and adjustment if needed. Please let me know if you would like to arrange another phone conference to discuss the particulars of the plan. Also, my summer calendar is beginning to fill up. If you have particular dates that you would like me to reserve to work with Ken-Ton Schools, let me know and I will reserve them if possible.

Thank you again for contacting me as a possible RTI consultant. I hope that we can work together!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Wright". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "J" and a cursive "Wright".

Jim Wright

NYS Certified School Psychologist and School Administrator

RTI Trainer and Consultant

Cell Phone: 315.720.6718

Email: jimw13159@gmail.com



Kenmore Town of Tonawanda UFSD: Proposal for RTI Training & Consultation

Introduction. The Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda Union Free School District ("Ken-Ton UFSD") is a school system in Western New York State with over 7000 students distributed across 7 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, and 2 high schools.

The district has committed to developing and expanding its Response to Intervention (RTI) model. Ken-Ton UFSD has established as 3 central goals during the current school year (through August 2016) that it will:

- conduct an audit to document the present state of RTI practices in all elementary, middle, and high schools;
- deliver introductory and refresher RTI training to key staff at the building and district levels responsible for RTI implementation;
- update the district's RTI Implementation Plan with a multi-year implementation timeline that includes all schools and embraces all levels, or Tiers, of academic support.

Presented here at the request of Ken-Ton UFSD is a proposal for RTI consultant Jim Wright to provide (1) RTI audit, (2) training, and (3) consultation/planning services for the district. The proposal projects a total of 8 days of onsite training/consultation services. The timeline for this proposal runs from the present through the end of August 2016. All RTI content embedded in this range of services is drawn from published research-based RTI guidelines (e.g., McDougal, Graney, Wright & Ardoin, 2009; Wright, 2007; Wright, 20012; Wright, 2014).

Stage 1: RTI Academic Audit: 4 Days. An audit will be conducted for Ken-Ton Schools at the district and building levels to determine what elements of Response to Intervention has been implemented and the quality with which this model is now being carried out.

Scope of the Work. RTI Tiers 1-3 will be included in this audit. (For a detailed overview of audit targets, see the checklist *RTI for Academics: Critical Elements* appearing later in this document.) Information will be collected via record review, face-to-face interviews, and stakeholder-completed questionnaires. Three consultant days will be used to conduct this audit.

For efficiency and economy, stakeholder groups from across the district will meet centrally for half-day interview sessions. Groups to be interviewed include:

- District administration (to include Departments of Instruction & Support Services and Special Education): half-day meeting.
- Building administrators: elementary schools: half-day meeting.
- Building administrators: middle & high schools: half-day meeting.
- Tier 2 service providers: elementary schools: half-day meeting.
- Tier 2 service providers: middle & high schools: half-day meeting.

Additionally, a half-day will be reserved for a detailed review of RTI-relevant district and building records (e.g., District RTI Plan; Academic Intervention Services (AIS) Plan, etc.).



Timeline & Deliverables. The RTI audit will be completed and a report of 5-6 pages summarizing audit findings will be shared with Ken-Ton UFSD by the end of May 2016. The RTI Audit Report will contain specific actionable recommendations to guide the district in its near- and medium-term RTI planning.

Stage 2: RTI-Academics Training: 4 Days. When the district-wide RTI audit is completed, staff development will be provided to targeted groups of district staff to bring them up to date on understanding and implementing RTI at all Tiers and grade levels.

Scope of the Work. A series of 4 workshop days are proposed that will provide essential entry-level knowledge of RTI to ensure that staff are ready to move forward with RTI implementation in the fall of 2016. Workshops to be presented include:

- *RTI: Overview for Administrators (Full Day).* This training provides building and district administrators spanning grades K-12 with a detailed understanding of the essential elements of RTI, including the 3 Tiers of academic intervention, the purpose and proper use of school-wide academic screening, the role of progress-monitoring in academic interventions, and the importance of enlisting staff support at the outset to support building-based RTI. The workshop also highlights typical roadblocks that can interfere with the RTI rollout, and suggested solutions for each.
- *Tier 1: Classroom Teacher Intervention Toolkit (Full Day).* This workshop is designed for building-based consultants (e.g., reading teachers, administrators, support staff, etc.) who will be tasked with helping teachers to design and implement classroom interventions. It provides a detailed look at the contents of the toolkit that classroom teachers will need to assume the role of Tier 1 (classroom) intervention 'first responder'. The training reviews a series of teacher-friendly and research-based academic interventions to address common student concerns such as reading fluency, reading comprehension, poor 'academic survival skills' (study and organization skills, etc.), and more. Participants will also try out a convenient 1-page form to document Tier 1 interventions and review methods to monitor student progress on classroom interventions. Additionally, a 'direct instruction' checklist is provided that can verify that a teacher has optimized whole-group 'core' instruction to effectively reach struggling learners.
- *Tier 2: Supplemental Interventions. (Full Day).* This training is ideal for building- and district personnel responsible for setting up, implementing, and evaluating the quality of Tier 2 (supplemental) small-group interventions. The workshop reviews the quality indicators of effective Tier 2 programs, investigates clearinghouse websites for locating Tier 2 programs that work, examines the roles of school-wide screening data and the Data Analysis Team in identifying at-risk students and placing them in appropriate Tier 2 services, and explores options for establishing entrance and exit criteria for Tier 2 services.
- *Tier 3: Problem-Solving Teams (Full Day).* Students with the most intensive intervention need (Tier 3) make up only a small fraction of the school population but take up a disproportionately large amount of educator time. This workshop trains members of building RTI Problem-Solving Teams to run efficient meetings to develop comprehensive intervention plans for students who have failed to respond to lesser interventions at Tiers 1 and 2. The training guides Teams to bring structure to these meetings by assigning formal roles and employing a prescribed meeting agenda. The training also presents decision rules that RTI Teams can use to decide whether a student is a 'non-responder' to RTI and should be referred to Committee on Special Education for a possible IEP.



Timeline & Deliverables. While workshops will be scheduled at the convenience of Ken-Ton UFSD; it is expected that they will start as early as June 2016 and will conclude by the end of August 2016. To assist the district in disseminating this workshop information, the trainer/consultant will create a custom webpage to serve as a repository for all information shared at the trainings, to include PowerPoints, handouts, and cited resources (e.g., RTI forms; academic intervention scripts, etc.). This web page will be available for all Ken-Ton UFSD administration and staff to access throughout the 2016-17 school year.

Stage 3: RTI-Academics Planning: 1 Day. After an RTI audit has revealed the current state of Response to Intervention in Ken-Ton UFSD and staff charged with implementation have received appropriate introductory training, the district will develop an internal multi-year plan for advancing RTI through all Tiers, schools, and grade levels.

Scope of the Work. It is recommended that--as large school systems such as Ken-Ton UFSD prepare to roll out the RTI model--they first establish a district-wide 'RTI Leadership Team'. This Team meets periodically across the school year to make informed decisions about RTI implementation that can then be adopted in a uniform manner across all buildings. To build momentum for RTI in the Ken-Ton UFSD, this RTI Leadership Team will be recruited and--at its initial summer meeting--will decide on the elements of an RTI plan to span at least the next 3 years. While the work of this Team is ongoing, one full day will be reserved to determine the outlines of the RTI rollout plan. This planning meeting will be facilitated by Jim Wright.

Timeline & Deliverables. The one-day planning conference for the RTI Leadership Team will take place before the end of August 2016. At the conclusion of that day, the Team will have agreed on the main elements of an RTI implementation plan. The Team will also receive a planning template to guide it in the drafting of its own RTI plan.

References

McDougal, J. L., Graney, S. B., Wright, J. A., & Ardoin, S. P. (2009). *RTI in practice: A practical guide to implementing effective evidence-based interventions in your school*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wright, J. (2007). *The RTI toolkit: A practical guide for schools*. Port Chester, NY: National Professional Resources, Inc.

Wright, J. (2012). *RTI success in secondary schools: A toolkit for middle and high schools*. Port Chester, NY: National Professional Resources, Inc.

Wright, J. (2014). *Strategies for struggling learners in the era of CCSS and RTI*. Port Chester, NY: National Professional Resources, Inc.



Critical RTI Elements: A Checklist

The elements below are important components of the RTI model. Review each element and discuss how to implement it in your school or district:

Tier 1 Interventions: Evidence-Based & Implemented With Integrity		
<i>Tier 1: Classroom Interventions.</i> The classroom teacher is the 'first responder' for students with academic delays. Classroom efforts to instruct and individually support the student should be documented.		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: High-Quality Core Instruction. The student receives high-quality core instruction in the area of academic concern. 'High quality' is defined as at least 80% of students in the classroom or grade level performing at or above gradewide academic screening benchmarks through classroom instructional support alone (Christ, 2008).	Inadequate or incorrectly focused core instruction may be an explanation for the student's academic delays.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: Classroom Intervention. The classroom teacher gives additional individualized academic support to the student beyond that provided in core instruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher documents those strategies on a Tier 1 intervention plan. • Intervention ideas contained in the plan meet the district's criteria as 'evidence-based'. • Student academic baseline and goals are calculated, and progress-monitoring data are collected to measure the impact of the plan. • The classroom intervention is attempted for a period sufficiently long (e.g., 4-8 instructional weeks) to fully assess its effectiveness. 	An absence of individualized classroom support or a poorly focused classroom intervention plan may contribute to the student's academic delays.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: Intervention Integrity. Data are collected to verify that the intervention is carried out with integrity (Gansle & Noell, 2007; Roach & Elliott, 2008). Relevant intervention-integrity data include information about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency and length of intervention sessions. • Ratings by the interventionist or an independent observer about whether all steps of the intervention are being conducted correctly. 	Without intervention-integrity data, it is impossible to discern whether academic underperformance is due to the student's 'non-response' to intervention or due to an intervention that was poorly or inconsistently carried out.

Tier 1: Decision Point: Teacher Consultation/Team Meeting		
<i>Decision Points:</i> At Tier 1, the school has set up procedures for teachers and other staff to discuss students who need intervention, to analyze data about their school performance, to design intervention and progress-monitoring plans, and to schedule follow-up meetings on the student(s).		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 1: Classroom Teacher Problem-Solving Meetings. The school has set up a forum for teachers to discuss students who need Tier 1 (classroom) interventions and to schedule follow-up meetings to evaluate progress. That forum takes one of two forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultant.</i> The school compiles a list of consultants in the school who can meet with individual teachers or grade-level teams to discuss specific students and to help the teacher to create and to document an intervention plan. • <i>Grade-Level Team.</i> The school trains grade-level teams to conduct problem-solving meetings. Teachers are expected 	If the school does not provide teachers with guidance and support in creating Tier 1 intervention plans, it cannot answer whether each teacher is consistently following recommended practices in developing those plans.



	to bring students to regularly scheduled team meetings to discuss them and to create and document an intervention plan.	
--	---	--

Tier 2/3 Interventions: Evidence-Based & Implemented With Integrity		
<i>Tiers 2 & 3: Supplemental Interventions.</i> Interventions at Tiers 2 & 3 supplement core instruction and specifically target the student's academic deficits.		
Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 2/3 Interventions: Minimum Number & Length. The student's cumulative RTI information indicates that an adequate effort in the general-education setting has been made to provide supplemental interventions at Tiers 2 & 3. The term 'sufficient effort' includes the expectation that within the student's general education setting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum number of separate Tier 2/3 intervention trials (e.g., three) are attempted. • Each intervention trial lasts a minimum period of time (e.g., 6-8 instructional weeks). 	A foundation assumption of RTI is that a general-education student with academic difficulties is typical and simply needs targeted instructional support to be successful. Therefore, strong evidence (i.e., several documented, 'good-faith' intervention attempts) is needed before the school can move beyond the assumption that the student is typical to consider whether there are possible 'within-child' factors such as a learning disability that best explain the student's academic difficulties.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 2/3 Interventions: Essential Elements. Each Tier 2/3 intervention plan shows evidence that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional programs or practices used in the intervention meet the district's criteria of 'evidence-based.' • The intervention has been selected because it logically addressed the area(s) of academic deficit for the target student (e.g., an intervention to address reading fluency was chosen for a student whose primary deficit was in reading fluency). • If the intervention is group-based, all students enrolled in the Tier 2/3 intervention group have a shared intervention need that could reasonably be addressed through the group instruction provided. • The student-teacher ratio in the group-based intervention provides adequate student support. NOTE: For Tier 2, group sizes should be capped at 7 students. Tier 3 interventions may be delivered in smaller groups (e.g., 3 students or fewer) or individually. • The intervention provides contact time adequate to the student academic deficit. NOTE: Tier 2 interventions should take place a minimum of 3-5 times per week in sessions of 30 minutes or more; Tier 3 interventions should take place daily in sessions of 30 minutes or more (Burns & Gibbons, 2008). 	Supplemental intervention programs are compromised if they are not based on research, are too large, or include students with very discrepant intervention needs. Schools cannot have confidence in the impact of such potentially compromised supplemental intervention programs.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Tier 2/3 Interventions: Intervention Integrity. Data are collected to verify that the intervention is carried out with integrity (Gansle & Noell, 2007; Roach & Elliott, 2008). Relevant intervention-integrity data include information about:	Without intervention-integrity data, it is impossible to discern whether academic underperformance is due to the



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Problem-Solving Teams as a quality-control mechanism and gate-keeper that prevents students from being referred for possible special education services until the school has first exhausted all general-education service options.
--	--	---

School-Wide Academic Screenings: General Outcome Measures and Skill-Based Measures

Peer Norms: The school selects efficient measures with good technical adequacy to be used to screen all students at a grade level in targeted academic areas.

Adequately Documented?	RTI Element	If this element is incomplete, missing, or undocumented...
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Selection of Academic Screening Measures. The school has selected appropriate grade-level screening measures for the academic skill area(s) in which the target student struggles (Hosp, Hosp & Howell, 2007). The selected screening measure(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have 'technical adequacy' as grade-level screeners—and have been researched and shown to predict future student success in the academic skill(s) targeted. • Are general enough to give useful information for at least a full school year of the developing academic skill (e.g., General Outcome Measure or Skill-Based Mastery Measure). • Include research norms, proprietary norms developed as part of a reputable commercial assessment product, or benchmarks to guide the school in evaluating the risk level for each student screened. 	Academic screening measures provide a shared standard for assessing student academic risk. If appropriate gradewide academic screening measure(s) are not in place, the school cannot efficiently identify struggling students who need additional intervention support or calculate the relative probability of academic success for each student.
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Local Norms Collected via Gradewide Academic Screenings at Least 3 Times Per Year. All students at each grade level are administered the relevant academic screening measures at least three times per school year. The results are compiled to provide local norms of academic performance.	In the absence of regularly updated local screening norms, the school cannot easily judge whether a particular student's skills are substantially delayed from those of peers in the same educational setting.

References

Burns, M. K., & Gibbons, K. A. (2008). *Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools*. Routledge: New York.

Christ, T. (2008). Best practices in problem analysis. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 159-176). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Fuchs, L. (2003). Assessing intervention responsiveness: Conceptual and technical issues. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 18(3), 172-186.

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.



Hosp, M. K., Hosp, J. L., & Howell, K. W. (2007). *The ABCs of CBM: A practical guide to curriculum-based measurement*. New York: Guilford Press.

Howell, K. W., Hosp, J. L., & Kurns, S. (2008). Best practices in curriculum-based evaluation. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp.349-362). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

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).

Shapiro, E. S. (2008). Best practices in setting progress-monitoring monitoring goals for academic skill improvement. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 141-157). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Witt, J. C., VanDerHeyden, A. M., & Gilbertson, D. (2004). Troubleshooting behavioral interventions. A systematic process for finding and eliminating problems. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 363-383.