

**DODGE CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL**  
**Tier II After School Immediate Response To Intervention**  
**ASIRTI**

**Introduction**

The goal of this proposal is twofold. First, by establishing the effectiveness associated with student performance gains, as it is related to Tier II After School Intervention Programs, and secondly by providing enough evidence to substantiate the need to provide students in grades 7-8 with a Tier II After School Immediate Response to Intervention Program in both math and reading. The ASIRTI Program (After School Immediate Response To Intervention) will be a two week after school re-teaching opportunity for any student scoring below 60% on their reading or math mastery checks. The ASIRTI program builds its foundations on the premise that every child’s learning style is unique, and that Tier II Interventions are essential to ensure that every child has an opportunity to learn. We also believe that offering an After School Intervention Program will help our school meet academic SMART goals and help our students succeed. Additionally, our staff and teachers are 100% committed to ensuring our school and district meets its AYP goals.

**School Profile and Demographics**

Dodge City Middle School is located in the rural urban community of Dodge City, Kansas. Sixty-Eight teachers, one librarian, two counselors, and three administrators serve the eight hundred and twelve students who attend our school in fifty-five classrooms. Currently, 411 seventh graders, and 376 eighth graders, attend Dodge City Middle School for a total of 792 students during the 2010 - 2011 school year. These students represent a broad spectrum of young adolescents, including high achievers, Limited English Proficient, special education, at-risk, disadvantaged, and displaced young adolescents. Dodge City Middle School serves a rural urban city, including a diverse socio-economic population. (Total Student Population = 792)

**Ethnic Composite**

- White = 238 .....30.05%
- Black = 22 ..... 2.7%
- Hispanic = 262 .....33.08%
- Am. Indian = 218 .....27.52%
- Asian = 11 ..... 1/38%
- Multi Ethnic = 41 ..... 5.17%
- ELL = 370 .....46.7%
- Free/Reduced = 655 .....82.7%

**Proposal Justification Statement**

Presently, our school has in place a school wide Tier III Intervention Program. This program provides a two hour block of time to build foundational skills while ensuring students have the opportunity to learn grade level essential indicators. In 2007 and in 2008 our school had a Tier II Immediate Response to Intervention Program that provided instructional support for students who were unable to master the essential indicators after each mastery check. During the 2008 - 2009 school year both Tier II and Tier III interventions were in place. The results of 2008 - 2009 Immediate Tier II Intervention Response Program, and the Tier III Intervention Programs together demonstrated significant gain in both math and reading. The 2009-2010 school year saw a decline in scores in both math and reading. This school year we are again faced with one variable of intervention that we believe had a significant impact on student performance: The Tier II After School Immediate Response To Intervention Program. The questions for which answers are to be sought in this proposal include the following:

### **Three Essential Questions of Effectiveness**

1. To what degree was the difference between the 2006 - 2007 math and reading scores as compared to 2007 - 2008 scores when **a** *Tier II* Intervention Program was in place?
2. To what degree was the difference between the 2007 - 2008 math and reading scores as compared to 2008 - 2009 scores when **both** *Tier II and Tier III* Intervention Programs were in place?
3. To what degree was the difference between the 2008 - 2009 math and reading scores as compared to 2009 - 2010 scores when only **a** *Tier III* Intervention Program was in place.

### **Evaluation Design**

The evaluation design for program effectiveness in the above context will be established through a three year comparative study of 7th and 8th grade student performances in math and reading when a Tier II After School Intervention Program is in place to further support student mastery of essential skills. Additionally the evaluation design will address program effectiveness when students in grades 7 and 8 are not provided the opportunity to attend an after school Tier II Immediate Response to Intervention Program. These variables are laid out within the study using three essential questions that are designed to evaluate consistent math and reading performance in terms of gains and losses over three consecutive years.

**Essential Question One:** To what degree was the difference between the 2006 - 2007 math and reading scores as compared to 2007 - 2008 scores when **a** *Tier II* Intervention Program was in place?

- In 2007 - 2008 a revised after school program was initiated to provide students with immediate instructional support after each mastery check was administered in 7th and 8th grade reading and math. During the 2007-2008 school year our state report card showed that students at Dodge City Middle School scored 65.4 % in reading proficiency while 55.1% scored proficient in math. As compared to the previous year's performance in both math and reading scores the school showed an overall increase of (+- 8%). A comparative chart below supports the initiative that having a *Tier II* After School Intervention Program may serve as a direct variable in improving student performance gains in both reading and math.

**CHART ONE**

2006 – 2007 Reading Score	2007 – 2008 Reading Score	Difference Growth Factor	2006 – 2007 Math Score	2007 – 2008 Math Score	Difference Growth Factor
58.6 %	65.4 %	7.8% Increase	47.1%	55.1%	8% Increase
100 (65.4/58.6 - 1) = 11.6041% Reading Gain			100 (55.1/47.1 - 1) = 16.9851% Math Gain		

**Essential Question Two:** To what degree was the difference between the 2007 - 2008 math and reading scores as compared to 2008 - 2009 scores when **both** *Tier II and Tier III* Intervention Programs were in place?

- During the next school year 2008-2009 a *Tier II and Tier III* Intervention Program was revised and implemented using the RTI model. The RTI model specified that the Tier III program would provide students with additional time in math and reading during the school day. While the revised Tier II After School Immediate Response to Intervention program provided students with eight hours of additional instructional time to master essential standards after each mastery check. During the 2008-2009 school year our state report card showed that our school increased reading proficiency to 78.6% (13.2% Increase) while math scores increased to 59.5% (13.3% Increase). A comparative chart below supports the initiative that having both a *Tier II and Tier III* Intervention Program in place may serve as a direct variable in improving student performance gains in reading and math.

### CHART TWO

2007 – 2008 Reading Score	2008 – 2009 Reading Score	Difference Growth Factor	2007 – 2008 Math Score	2008 – 2009 Math Score	Difference Growth Factor
65.4 %	78.6 %	13.2% Increase	46.2 %	59.5 %	13.3% Increase
100 (78.6/65.4 - 1) = 20.1835% Reading Gain			100 (59.5/46.2 - 1) = 28.7879% Math Gain		

**Essential Question Three:** To what degree was the difference between the 2008 - 2009 math and reading scores as compared to 2009 - 2010 scores when only a Tier III Intervention Program was in place?

- During the 2009-2010 school year with the continuation of the Tier III Intervention Program and the decision to drop the Tier II After School Intervention Program based on state's financial shortfall our state report card showed that our school scored 76% in reading proficiency while being 58% proficient in math. As compared to the previous year's performance, in both math and reading scores, the school showed an overall decrease of (+-2%). A comparative chart below supports the initiative that not having a Tier II After School Intervention Program may serve as a direct variable in establishing the significant impact that the Tier II After School Intervention Program has on student performance gains in both reading and math.

### CHART THREE

2008 – 2009 Reading Score	2009 – 2010 Reading Score	Difference Growth Factor	2007 – 2008 Math Score	2009 – 2010 Math Score	Difference Growth Factor
78.6 %	76%	-2.6% Decrease	59.5 %	58%	-1.5% Decrease
100 (1 - 76/78.6) = - 3.30789% Reading Decrease			100 (1 - 58/59.5) = - 2.52101% Math Decrease		

### **Evaluation Summary**

This study may provide conclusive evidence that After School Programs do have a significant impact in student learning when providing students with immediate response to intervention directly after not meeting the set benchmark on a mastery check. There is conclusive evidence that over a three year longitudinal study that the after school program described within the context of the study has a consistent variable in student performance gains during the years it was used as a Tier II Intervention Program. (See Chart 1 and Chart 2) This conclusive evidence appears to be substantiated as math and reading achievement data is compared to performance gains made in 2008 and 2009 against a decrease of performance gains in 2010. (See Chart 3)

What is strikingly apparent is when both Tier II and Tier III Interventions are simultaneously being used within the RTI model, a 13% increase in student performance in both math and reading. In fact, the correlation data in student performance, when both Tier II and Tier III Interventions are in place, shows a significant gain in reading of 20.1835%, while math scores showed the highest percentage gain of 28.7879%. The study may have a conclusion summary that the exclusion of the After School Program in 2009 may have caused a (-23.4914% difference in student performance in reading) and a (-31.3089% difference in math performance) over a one year period of time. It is ultimately uncertain that the Tier II After School Program may be the one and only variable that provided significant growth in student math and reading performances in the 2009 - 2010 school year. But what is certainly conclusive in the study is that essential questions, one and two, are of significant value when reviewing the program's effectiveness. These two essential questions do show that a Tier II After School Intervention Program may have a significant impact on school improvement and a school's goal of achieving AYP results.

This three year study, of comparative performance results in reading and math, may also provide guidance in future decisions for Tier II After School Intervention Programs as described within the context of this proposal. (See Project Proposal) It would be our hopes that consideration be given to the approval of this proposal based on the evaluation study in terms of making significant progress in AYP obtainment. If correlated with cost analysis and gains in student achievement, the variable of cost has little impact on the district budget since at risk funds have already been allocated to support the program.

### **Project Proposal**

Currently, our school measures student's growth in the area of reading, math, science and social studies. This data is used to design instruction for students using our RTI (Response To Intervention) program. In the area of math and reading students are assessed using five scheduled mastery checks throughout the school year as determined by the schools pacing guide. Unfortunately, to date there is limited resources in time available to address the needs of the students that are testing below set benchmarks and need immediate response to Tier II Interventions in one or more of the four subject areas.

This project identifies students in the area of math and reading, who are not currently receiving additional Tier III services. Additionally, this proposal will address how our school will provide interventions in both science and social studies during the school day.

The acceptance of this proposal, allowing our school to initiate an after school immediate response to math and reading interventions, provides teachers the time to implement Tier II Interventions during home-base advisory, in the academic areas of science and social studies, for students who are testing below the set benchmarks.

The ASIRTI Program (After School Immediate Response To Intervention) will be a two week after school re-teaching opportunity for any student scoring below 60% on their reading or math mastery checks. (See Grouping Scheduling) The after school intervention program will provide eight hours of extended day intervention time from 3:00-4:00 P.M. Mondays through Thursdays. A second mastery check will be given on the 8th day of instruction to check for 80% mastery. Any student who does not make 80% mastery on the second mastery check will be provided Tier III Interventions for another four hours of instruction. Tier III Interventions are to be made up of no more than two to four students in a group and will be held on the Saturday following the second mastery check.

### **Grouping/Scheduling (Math and Reading)**

Mastery Check One Interventions September 27<sup>th</sup> – October 7<sup>th</sup> (Second Mastery Check)

- October 9<sup>th</sup> Tier III Intervention

Mastery Check Two Interventions October 25<sup>th</sup> – November 4<sup>th</sup> (Second Mastery Check)

- November 6<sup>th</sup> Tier III Intervention

Mastery Check Three Interventions: November 29<sup>th</sup> – December 9<sup>th</sup> (Second Mastery Check)

- December 11<sup>th</sup> Tier III Intervention

Mastery Check Four Interventions: January 10<sup>th</sup> – January 20<sup>th</sup> (Second Mastery Check)

- January 22<sup>nd</sup> Tier III Intervention

Mastery Check Five Interventions: February 14<sup>th</sup> – February 24<sup>th</sup> (Second Mastery Check)

- February 26<sup>th</sup> Tier III Intervention

### **Future Program Evaluation**

- The goal, of this math and reading after school Tier II Intervention Program, is to increase student math benchmark scores for grades 7-8 in our school.
- By the end of the first year of full implementation, the goal is to see the percentage of students currently below proficiency decreased by at least 30%.
- By the end of the first year of implementation, overall math and reading scores will increase by 20% over the previous year's scores.
- As the intervention process becomes more effective, we hope to see continuous improvement of between 3 to 5% yearly.

### **Areas To Be Considered**

- Will the budget allow for funds in the area of Tier II math and reading After School Intervention under the current financial crisis?
- Will trained staff be available to manage the intervention schedule?
- What is the availability of trained staff to facilitate the intervention groups?
- Will an after school program be available after the first mastery check to ensure students have an opportunity to receive instruction on indicators not mastered in the first mastery check?

### **Progress Monitoring/Benchmark Assessments**

- The same decision rules, which guided the After School Tier II math and reading Program in 2008-2009, will be duplicated for the 2010-2011 After School Program. Although we will add an additional component that will address the Tier III students, who are not at mastery after the second mastery check, we will also continue to use the mastery check pacing guide for regularly administered math and reading assessments. The system will be used as a means to regularly progress monitor and track students who are receiving interventions.
- Benchmark mastery checks will take place every nine weeks as outlined in the proposal.
- Progress monitoring by teams will take place for all students below 80%. Those students that fall between the 60 to 79% will be monitored every two weeks. Students falling below 59% will be monitored weekly.
- PLC grade level meetings, which occur once a week, will discuss instructional strategies for students who are not mastering the essential indicators in social studies, math, reading and science.

### **Proposal Staffing and Budget**

#### **Mastery Check One - Interventions September 27<sup>th</sup> – October 7<sup>th</sup>**

- Teachers 12
- Coaches 3

15 Hours @ \$28.23 = \$423.45 X 8 Days = \$3,387.60

#### **Saturday Tutoring-Tier III – October 9<sup>th</sup>**

- Teachers 12 @ 4 hours = 48 Hours

48 Hours @ \$28.23 = \$1,355.04

---

#### **Mastery Check Two – Interventions October 25<sup>th</sup> – November 4<sup>th</sup>**

- Teachers 12
- Coaches 3

15 Hours @ \$28.23 = \$423.45 X 8 Days = \$3,387.60

#### **Saturday Tutoring-Tier III – November 6<sup>th</sup>**

- Teachers 12 @ 4 hours = 48 Hours

48 Hours @ \$28.23 = 1,355.04

**Mastery Check Three** – Interventions November 29<sup>th</sup> – December 9<sup>th</sup>

- Teachers 12
- Coaches 3

15 Hours @ \$28.23 = \$423.45 X 8 Days = \$3,387.60

**Saturday Tutoring-Tier III** – December 11<sup>th</sup>

- Teachers 12 @ 4 hours = 48 Hours

48 Hours @ \$28.23 = 1,355.04

---

**Mastery Check Four** – Interventions January 10<sup>th</sup> – January 20<sup>th</sup>

- Teachers 12
- Coaches 3

15 Hours @ \$28.23 = \$423.45 X 8 Days = \$3,387.60

**Saturday Tutoring-Tier III** – January 22<sup>nd</sup>

- Teachers 12 @ 4 hours = 48 Hours

48 Hours @ \$28.23 = 1,355.04

---

**Mastery Check Five** – February 14<sup>th</sup> – February 24<sup>th</sup>

- Teachers 12
- Coaches 3

15 Hours @ \$28.23 = \$423.45 X 8 Days = \$3,387.60

**Saturday Tutoring-Tier III** – February 26<sup>th</sup>

- Teachers 12 @ 4 hours = 48 Hours

48 Hours @ \$28.23 = 1,355.04

---

**Total Tier II and III Budget**

• Tire II Intervention Mastery Checks .....	\$16,938.00
• Tier III Saturday Tutoring.....	<u>\$ 6,775.20</u>
Total .....	\$23,713.20