

Response to Intervention for Specific Learning Disabilities Identification: The Impact of Graduate Preparation and Experience on Identification Consistency

Kathrin E. Maki

Ball State University

ABSTRACT: Response to intervention (RTI) is increasingly being implemented in schools as a means to identify students with specific learning disabilities (SLD). Despite its wide use, there is limited research regarding school psychologists' graduate preparation in and familiarity with RTI for SLD identification. This study examined how school psychologists' graduate preparation in RTI, use of RTI in practice, and preference for RTI in SLD identification impacted SLD identification consistency using RTI. Participants included 110 school psychologists who were recruited from state school psychology associations. Participants viewed RTI SLD identification criteria and student evaluation data and then made an SLD identification decision. Results showed that participants' graduate preparation in RTI, use of RTI in regular district practice, and preference for RTI for SLD identification did not increase the likelihood of consistent SLD identification using RTI. Implications for practice and training in RTI for SLD identification are discussed.

Identification of specific learning disabilities (SLD) is likely one of the most controversial and debated topics within the field of education (Burns, Maki, Warmbold-Brann, & Preast, in press). There is considerable variability in SLD identification rates across states (Maki, Floyd, & Roberson, 2015), and students with SLD represent approximately 35% of all students receiving special education services across the United States. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). Thus, SLD identification may impact the educational programming of a large number of students with potentially significant effects at the individual student level, given that inconsistent identification could result in inappropriate service provision. It is therefore imperative that identification procedures result in consistent identification decisions and improved student outcomes (Cromwell, Blashfield, & Strauss, 1975; Maki, Burns, & Sullivan, 2017).

Response to Intervention

Serious psychometric and conceptual issues regarding the ability–achievement discrepancy approach to SLD identification have driven the need for alternative SLD identification methods (Stuebing, Fletcher, Branum-Martin, & Francis, 2012), which were authorized in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004. IDEA 2004 states that local education agencies (LEAs) “may use a process that determines if the child responds to scientific, research-based intervention as

a part of the evaluation procedures” (§ 614 [b][6][A]; § 614 [b][2 & 3]), commonly referred to as response to intervention (RTI). RTI is now a widely implemented SLD identification method (Maki et al., 2015) and, more broadly, is a resource allocation framework that uses assessment data to implement tiered instruction and intervention supports for all students (Burns & Gibbons, 2012). When students do not demonstrate adequate responsiveness to increasingly intensive academic supports, they may be identified with SLD (Kovaleski, VanDerHeyden, & Shapiro, 2013). Most commonly, students may be identified as having SLD when they demonstrate a dual discrepancy in which both achievement level and growth rate are below their peers’ or research-based criteria (Kovaleski et al., 2013). However, there are no widely accepted criteria for nonresponse.

There is considerable variability in RTI SLD identification across states, just as there is for special education identification in general (Hauerwas, Brown, & Scott, 2013). For example, some state regulations may only incorporate the language from IDEA, while other states provide additional criteria required for RTI SLD identification including achievement below a specified level, a minimum number of progress monitoring data points, and fidelity of implementation data (Maki et al., 2015). Such variability in identification practices could result in inconsistent identification of students, which is problematic given the high-stakes nature of special education identification decisions (Salvia, Ysseldyke, & Bolt, 2012). Moreover, by definition, students being evaluated for special education services demonstrate severe educational needs, and thus consistent identification is necessary to ensure that students receive needed support in school.

Strengths and Outcomes of RTI

RTI arguably holds several benefits over other approaches to SLD identification (e.g., ability–achievement discrepancy, patterns of strengths and weaknesses [PSW]; Burns et al., in press). RTI may allow for early identification by implementing intervention supports upon initial detection of student difficulties (Vaughn & Fuchs, 2003). Moreover, there is a direct link between assessment data and intervention, which is a fundamental component of identification systems (Cromwell et al., 1975; Salvia et al., 2012). The link between assessment data and intervention within RTI also results in low-inference decisions, which is necessary to ensure consistent identification (Christ & Arañas, 2015). The RTI method is in contrast to discrepancy and PSW methods that rely on the measurement of cognitive processes under the assumption that processing deficits cause low achievement. However, these methods lack treatment validity because training of cognitive processes does not result in improved achievement (Kearns & Fuchs, 2013; Melby-Lurvig & Hume, 2013). Finally, because RTI relies on multiple data points over time for SLD identification, it may result in more reliable decisions over ability–achievement discrepancy and PSW, which utilize less reliable difference scores at one point in time (Fletcher, 2012).

RTI models have also demonstrated effectiveness at both the system and student levels (Marston, Lau, Muyskens, & Wilson, 2016; Shapiro, 2016) and have resulted in reductions in overall and racially disproportionate special education referrals (Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005; VanDerHeyden, Witt, & Gilbertson, 2007) and improved student achievement (Burns et al., 2005). Moreover, systematically implemented targeted Tier 2 interventions, monitoring progress, and screening were effective components of RTI models (Gersten et al., 2009). Conversely, a recent study by Balu et al. (2015) suggested that Tier 2 interventions within RTI models resulted in negative or no effects on student achievement. However, findings may be confounded because the study relied on teacher self-report of RTI practices and included schools using different procedures for identifying students in need of intervention, and the control group included students who received intervention (Shinn & Brown, 2016).

Is RTI Identifying SLD?

Over time, SLD became synonymous with the concept of unexpected underachievement (i.e., achievement below that predicted by cognitive ability), and critics of RTI have asserted that not measuring cognitive processes necessitates a conceptual change in what it means to have an SLD (Kavale & Spaulding, 2008). Arguably, RTI uses below-expected achievement and growth to identify underachievers (Burns et al., in

press), but it is unclear if RTI differentiates between expected and unexpected underachievement without the assessment of cognitive abilities (Kavale & Spaulding, 2008). RTI was not initially conceptualized as an SLD identification method, and thus additional validity evidence is necessary to ensure that this conceptualization of unexpected underachievement results in reliable and valid identification decisions (Burns, Jacob, & Wagner, 2008). There is some evidence that nonresponders (and thus students likely to be identified with SLD) demonstrated lower achievement than did students who were responsive to intervention (Al Otaiba & Fuchs, 2006; Burns, Silberglitt, Christ, Gibbons, & Coolong-Chaffin, 2016), suggesting meaningful differences between responders and nonresponders.

Despite the demonstrated effectiveness of RTI, there are a number of underlying issues regarding the use of RTI to identify students with SLD. First, SLD identification decisions using RTI are variable, dependent upon the operationalization of nonresponse (Barth et al., 2008), and may not be stable over time (Brown Waesche, Schatschneider, Maner, Ahmed, & Wagner, 2011). Second, the quality of interventions and progress monitoring tools is also variable, which can lead to inconsistent decisions. For instance, there is considerable research on effective interventions and the use of curriculum-based measures (CBM) to monitor student progress in reading but far less research on such tools in other academic areas (McMaster, Parker, & Jung, 2012). Even under the best conditions such as using multiple assessments, which increases CBM reliability, the data can still result in unreliable decisions (Christ, Zopluoglu, Monaghan, & Van Norman, 2013). Third, RTI implementation at the secondary level is not well understood (Vaughn & Fletcher, 2012) and is implemented less frequently than in elementary schools (Spectrum K-12 School Solutions, 2010). Fourth, RTI implementation is difficult and often inconsistent (Balu et al., 2015). Without implementation fidelity, it is impossible to make valid decisions regarding student responsiveness to intervention (Noell & Gansle, 2016) and thus SLD identification.

School Psychologist Preparation

Graduate preparation is foundational to school psychologists' practice and relevant skill application in schools. Importantly, rigorous training standards, like those adhered to by NASP-approved programs, may lead to improved psychological skills, as school psychologists trained in NASP-approved programs scored higher on the PRAXIS exam than school psychologists from other programs not approved by NASP (Rossen, Hayes, Prus, & Bowman, 2016). Rigorous preparation in RTI should therefore represent an important component of school psychologists' professional development to ensure consistent implementation. However, school psychologists reported limited knowledge regarding reading interventions and assessments in RTI models (Barrett, Cottrell, Newman, Pierce, & Anderson, 2015), which is problematic given that intervention and assessment within RTI represent a foundational aspect of school psychological practice (NASP, 2010). Moreover, Barrett et al. (2015) reported less focus on RTI than ability-achievement discrepancy models in graduate preparation programs. These findings are concerning considering the increasing use of RTI and the declining use of discrepancy models in SLD identification (Maki et al., 2015). However, Barrett et al. (2015) only focused on graduate school preparation and did not examine how such preparation relates to decision-making outcomes. Additionally, school psychologists reported that the majority of their training in RTI was from postgraduate workshops and inservice training, which is problematic because these training methods are not effective for long-term skill building (Sullivan & Long, 2010). However, these findings were reflective of training in RTI broadly and not specific to SLD identification.

Purpose

The reauthorization of IDEA in 2004 changed the landscape of SLD identification. In late 2013, approximately 20% of states required sole use of RTI to identify students with SLD, and an additional 18% of state departments of education provided guidance for the use of RTI combined with other SLD identification methods (Maki et al., 2015). It is likely that even more states are relying on RTI for SLD identification in 2017. However, there is limited research regarding school psychologists' SLD identification decision-making when using RTI. Maki et al. (2017) found that school psychologists made inconsistent identification decisions using RTI about 20% of the time. Thus, a significant number of

students may not receive needed academic support or may receive an inaccurate, potentially stigmatizing SLD label. School psychologists play a leading role on multidisciplinary teams (NASP, 2010), making it especially important to ensure that their graduate preparation results in consistent SLD identification. It is therefore essential to understand their identification decisions and how graduate preparation relates to such decisions. In addition, the increased use of RTI for SLD identification necessitates comprehensive preparation in RTI to ensure consistent identification and appropriate service provision. However, there is no known research that examines how school psychologists' preparation in RTI relates to their SLD identification decision-making. The purpose of the present study, therefore, is to examine the impact of school psychologists' graduate preparation in and experience with RTI on the consistency of their RTI SLD identification decisions. The following research questions guided the study: (a) to what extent does graduate preparation in RTI impact the consistency of SLD identification using RTI, (b) what is the impact of using RTI in district identification practices on the consistency of SLD identification using RTI, and (c) to what extent does preference for RTI in SLD identification impact the consistency of SLD identification using RTI?

METHOD

Participants

The data from this study were drawn from a larger study examining school psychologists' identification of SLD. Participants were sampled from 22 state school psychology associations (SPAs) and included 110 licensed or certified school psychologists who practiced in public schools and participated in multidisciplinary teams making special education identification decisions. The majority of participants identified as female (86.4%; $n = 95$). Most participants identified as Caucasian (94.5%, $n = 104$), while 1.8% ($n = 2$) identified as Latino, 1.8% ($n = 2$) identified as Asian/Pacific Islander, 1.8% ($n = 2$) identified as African American, and 0.9% did not report their race/ethnicity. Most participants (61.8%, $n = 68$) held a specialist degree; 21.8% held a master's degree ($n = 22$), and 16.4% ($n = 18$) held a doctoral degree. Twenty percent of participants had practiced for more than 20 years ($n = 22$); 23.6% ($n = 26$) had practiced for 11–20 years; 18.2% ($n = 20$) had practiced for 6–10 years; and 37.3% ($n = 41$) had practiced for 5 years or fewer.

The 22 SPAs to whom the study was distributed represented all four regions of NASP. Participants from the central region comprised 37.3% ($n = 41$) of participants (compared to 23.0% of NASP membership), 25.5% ($n = 28$) of participants were from the northeast region (compared to 33.6% of NASP membership), 21.8% ($n = 24$) of participants were from the west region (compared to 21.8% of NASP membership), and 14.5% ($n = 16$) of participants were from the southeast region (compared to 21.6% of NASP membership).

SLD Identification Criteria

Participants viewed RTI SLD identification criteria, which were obtained from state special education regulations. All 51 state regulations (including Washington, DC) were analyzed to obtain regulations using RTI for SLD identification and requiring additional identification documentation (e.g., achievement performance below a specified level, growth below a specified slope, required number of weeks in intervention, required number of progress monitoring data points) to provide participants with more objective criteria. Seven states required such additional identification documentation, and from those states, one state's RTI SLD identification criteria were randomly chosen for use in this study. All participants viewed the same set of identification criteria.

Student Evaluation Data

Participants reviewed de-identified student evaluation data, which were obtained from a U.S. public school district that uses RTI for SLD identification. The student evaluation data were from a third-grade Caucasian male because student demographics have been shown to correlate with identification decisions (Skiba et al., 2008). Student evaluation data included a pseudonym, race/ethnicity, birthdate, age, grade, testing

dates, and student test scores. Test score data were comprised of (a) CBM data that included growth rate and seasonal benchmark expectations for third-grade students and (b) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP; Northwest Evaluation Association, 2003) achievement data. Confidence intervals were provided for all scores and growth rate. The author and an advanced school psychology graduate student independently reviewed the student evaluation data to determine SLD status (i.e., SLD or not SLD), and both made SLD identification decisions consistent with the original school-based SLD identification.

Measure

Participants completed an evaluation questionnaire containing questions regarding their SLD identification decision-making and demographic information (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, years practicing, type of school district, highest degree earned). Internal consistency for the measure was computed ($\Omega = .84$).

Procedures

The study was approved by the university's institutional review board. The author contacted all 51 state SPAs by e-mail, telephone, or both to inquire about their allowance for research with association members. Of the 51 SPAs, 45 (88%) were reached, 33 (73%) of those 45 SPAs allowed for research to be conducted with association members, and 22 (67%) of the SPAs allowing for research approved dissemination of the study.

The study participation request, which included study background information and a hyperlink, was distributed to SPA members via electronic mailing list (68%, $n = 15$), posting on the SPA website (27%, $n = 6$), or by mail (5%, $n = 1$) at one point in time, and no reminders were sent. There were no significant differences in return rate across distribution methods ($p = .151$).

Participants used a study-unique URL to access the study via a secure online server. Information regarding the study's purpose, the potential risks and benefits of participation, and notification of the voluntary and anonymous nature of the study was provided. If potential participants agreed to participate in the study, the server presented two participation eligibility questions: (a) Are you a practicing licensed or certified school psychologist in the United States, and (b) do you participate in multidisciplinary teams making special education identification decisions? Eighty-two percent (110) of 134 eligible school psychologists completed the survey.

The participant was first presented with the RTI SLD identification criteria and instructed to review the criteria carefully. The participant then viewed student evaluation data and was asked to use the identification criteria to make an identification decision. Participants were informed that all exclusionary criteria (e.g., visual, motor, hearing, emotional disturbance, economic disadvantage) were ruled out as potential impacts on the student's academic performance. The server then presented the participant with the evaluation questionnaire.

Research Design and Analyses

Because the independent variables represented preexisting groups, a quasi-experimental research design was used to examine the research questions. A priori power analyses (power = .80, $\alpha = .05$, Odds Ratio = 2.7 [based on Maki et al., 2017]) indicated that a sample size of 78 was needed. A logistic regression model was fitted to the data with identification consistency serving as the outcome variable. Identification consistency was operationally defined as a match between the original SLD status of the student evaluation data (i.e., SLD identification decision made by the student's school and confirmed by the author) and the participant's identification decision. Graduate preparation SLD identification method (i.e., participant preparation in RTI in graduate school), district SLD identification method (i.e., participant use of RTI in daily practice), and preferred SLD identification method (i.e., participant preference for RTI) served as independent variables, and were entered into the model simultaneously.

RESULTS

Prior to fitting the logistic regression model, the data were analyzed for missing data, and the correlations among the independent variables were examined to ensure that multicollinearity would not interfere with the model fit. There were no missing data, and most of the independent variables were not significantly or meaningfully correlated. However, district SLD identification method and preferred SLD identification method were significantly correlated ($r = .40, p < .05$). The correlation was moderate, and it was hypothesized that the variables represented theoretically different constructs, and thus both variables should be included in the model (O'Brien, 2007). Correlations among the independent variables are presented in Table 1.

Descriptive statistics for the independent variables were also calculated prior to fitting the logistic regression model. Approximately 37.27% ($n = 41$) of participants reported graduate preparation in RTI, 41.80% ($n = 46$) reported use of RTI in district practice, and 51.80% ($n = 57$) reported preference for RTI in SLD identification. The model including the independent variables did not result in better model fit than the null model with the intercept only ($\chi^2(3, N = 110) = 0.22, p = .57$), and both models resulted in a probability of 79% identification consistency. Thus, graduate preparation in RTI, use of RTI in district practice, and preference for RTI in SLD identification did not result in predictive utility of participant likelihood of making a consistent SLD identification decision. The results are presented in Table 2 as probabilities of making a consistent SLD identification decision for ease of interpretation.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the effect of school psychologists' preparation in and experience with RTI on the consistency of their SLD identification decisions. Overall identification consistency was 79%, and

Table 1. Correlations Among Predictor Variables

Variable	Correlations		
	GPM	DM	PM
GPM	1.0	0.13	0.26
DM		1.0	0.40*
PM			1.0

Note. GPM = graduate preparation in response to intervention (RTI) for specific learning disabilities (SLD) identification; DM = use of RTI as district SLD identification method; PM = preference for RTI as SLD identification method.

* = $p < 0.05$

Table 2. Logistic Regression Results of SLD Identification Consistency

Variable	<i>B</i>	SE	Wald	<i>p</i>	Probability
Constant	1.35	0.62	8.15	<.05	0.79
GPM	0.01	0.14	0.22	.64	0.79
DM	0.24	0.17	0.01	.71	0.75
PM	-0.05	0.10	0.18	.42	0.80

Note. GPM = graduate preparation in response to intervention (RTI) for specific learning disabilities (SLD) identification, DM = use of RTI as district SLD identification method, PM = preference for RTI as SLD identification method.

$\chi^2(3, N = 110) = 0.22, p = .57$.

participant graduate preparation in RTI, use of RTI in practice, and preference for RTI in SLD identification did not increase the likelihood that the participant made a consistent SLD identification decision. Such findings are concerning because consistent identification decisions are necessary to ensure appropriate service provision. Moreover, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that appropriate preparation in and frequent use of RTI for SLD identification should increase consistency of SLD identification using RTI.

Approximately 37% of study participants reported graduate preparation in RTI, which may reflect the fact that RTI represents a relatively new method for identifying students with SLD (Maki et al., 2015). Thus, the extent to which graduate programs are currently preparing students in RTI for SLD identification is not clear from this study, as there may be a relationship between graduate preparation in RTI and the years during which participants attended graduate school. Despite the growing implementation of RTI, there has been limited research available on school psychologists' preparation in RTI for SLD identification during graduate school and through ongoing professional development, and on how such preparation relates to SLD identification decisions. It is necessary to ensure that practicing school psychologists have adequate preparation in and familiarity with RTI to support consistent SLD identification decisions (Sullivan & Long, 2010), which consequently should ensure that students receive necessary academic support in schools and do not receive an unnecessary, potentially stigmatizing special education label.

Implementation of RTI for SLD identification represents a significant shift in the role of school psychologists, despite the fact that school psychologists continue to spend a large portion of their time conducting assessments (Curtis, Castillo, & Gelley, 2012). This extends the paradigm shift within the field of school psychology broadly from traditional assessment that focused on within-child problems to ecological frameworks that rely on assessment to intervention models (Reschly, 2008). Thus, this shift necessitates adequate preparation in RTI (Crepeau-Hobson & Sobel, 2010) to ensure proper implementation and valid SLD identification decisions. However, findings from this study suggest that the preparation and practices in which school psychologists engaged did not contribute to the consistency of their SLD identification decisions. These results are problematic because preparation (during graduate school and ongoing professional development) should lead to competence in these fundamental skills (Armistead, 2015).

Implications for Practice and Training

Although approximately 37% of participants reported graduate preparation in RTI for SLD identification, preparation in and experience with RTI did not increase the likelihood of making a consistent SLD identification decision. These results seem to confirm the findings of Barrett et al. (2015) and Sullivan and Long (2010) that suggested that graduate preparation in RTI lacked rigor and that a limited number of intermittent professional development sessions is insufficient to build competency in RTI. Graduate trainers should ensure that coursework covers RTI implementation from systemic and individual student perspectives and in relation to SLD identification decisions (Barrett et al., 2015; Crepeau-Hobson & Sobel, 2010). Such preparation is fundamental to school psychologists' skill development; nevertheless, skills continue to develop after graduate school (Ysseldyke et al., 2008), and the field is likely to continue to evolve. It is thus necessary to also focus on postgraduate training. The current study did not examine professional development in RTI SLD identification directly; however, use of RTI in district SLD identification practice did not increase the likelihood of a consistent identification decision, which suggests that practitioners may benefit from rigorous ongoing professional development in RTI SLD identification. Sullivan and Long (2010) found that most school psychologists who received postgraduate training in RTI did so through one-time trainings (e.g., workshops and inservice professional development), which may be an ineffective method of training (Kratochwill, 2007). A more effective model of professional development is one that is ongoing and embedded within school psychologists' practice (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Kratochwill, 2007) and is focused on critical components of RTI models (e.g., screening, tiered interventions, monitoring student progress, fidelity of implementation) and application of RTI to SLD identification (i.e., definitions of adequate achievement and growth, resources needed for appropriate student support; Kovalski et al., 2013). Future research could examine how differences in the rigor of professional development impact SLD identification consistency.

Furthermore, professional school psychological practice necessitates regular self-evaluation and feedback from supervisors and peers (NASP, 2010). Conscientious, reflective practice can lead to the use of scientifically based practice, improved professional performance (including decision making), and, consequently, improved student achievement (Williams & Monahan, 2015), which is the ultimate goal of school psychological practice (NASP, 2010). To ensure effectiveness, school psychologists should monitor their own RTI practices, including training in and application of fundamental skills for RTI implementation (e.g., use of psychometrically adequate assessment tools, implementation fidelity, patterns of SLD identification decisions), and they should examine student outcomes to ensure that their practice is positively impacting students.

Limitations

Although the findings from this study hold important implications for school psychological practice and preparation, they should be considered within the context of their limitations. The study used a quasi-experimental design because participants' preparation in and experience with RTI created preexisting groups that did not allow for random assignment. Although the power analyses suggested sufficient power to detect statistically significant results, it is possible that the nonsignificant findings were a reflection of inadequate power. Participants in this study also made the SLD identification decisions in isolation, whereas such decisions are supposed to be made as part of a multidisciplinary team in typical practice (IDEA of 2004, § 303.24). Therefore, the study findings are limited in their generalizability to best practices regarding SLD identification.

Participants were provided with a specific set of RTI SLD identification criteria, and they may not have been familiar with those criteria. It is possible that even with graduate preparation in and practical experience with RTI for SLD identification, use of the specified identification criteria in this study created a novel identification experience for participants. Thus, the nonsignificant findings in this study may be a reflection of a lack of familiarity with the specific criteria used in this study rather than inadequate preparation in RTI SLD identification. However, a potential relationship between familiarity with specific identification criteria and inconsistent identification decisions underscores the problems associated with SLD identification criteria differing by state. These differing criteria undermine SLD identification broadly and the construct of SLD in general and further highlight the need for rigorous preparation in SLD identification, given the ambiguity surrounding it (Maki et al., 2015). Furthermore, although efforts were made to ensure that school psychologists were representative of practicing school psychologists nationally, it is possible that those who choose to be members of state SPAs differ from school psychologists who choose not to be members. Because the study was distributed through state SPA websites, e-mail, and electronic mailing lists, it is unknown how many SPA members viewed the distribution materials, and thus it is not possible to compute an accurate completion percentage. Finally, due to methodological constraints, consistency of identification was based upon a match between the participant's identification decision for one evaluation case and school-based identification (confirmed by the author) rather than consistency across multiple participant identification decisions. Future research could examine identification consistency by having participants make multiple SLD identification decisions.

Conclusion

School psychologists are uniquely positioned to make SLD identification decisions within RTI frameworks. School psychologists who develop expertise in traditional assessment for special education as well as an understanding of education systems, prevention, and intervention can gain the knowledge and skills necessary to implement effective RTI models and to make consistent and accurate SLD identification decisions within such models. Extensive graduate preparation and ongoing embedded professional development in RTI should be implemented to ensure that school psychologists develop skills in this area and continue to hone them. Inconsistency of SLD identification not only has the potential to undermine the conceptualization and identification of the construct, but importantly may also hinder the development of students' academic skills if they do not receive needed academic support.

RESOURCES

National Center for Intensive Intervention (<http://www.intensiveintervention.org>): Provides information on data-based interventions and progression monitoring for students with severe academic and behavior needs.

National Center on RTI (<http://www.rti4success.org>): Provides information regarding RTI including screening, progress monitoring, and intervention.

National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (<http://www.ldonline.org/about/partners/njcd/>): Provides information on relevant special education law, research-based information, and resources on learning disabilities.

RTI Action Network (<http://www.rtinetwork.org>): Includes SLD identification toolkit and instructional videos for RTI implementation.

The RTI approach to evaluating learning disabilities (Kovaleski et al., 2013): Provides comprehensive information regarding the use of RTI to identify students with SLDs.

REFERENCES

- Al Otaiba, S., & Fuchs, D. (2006). Who are the young children for whom best practices in reading are ineffective? An experimental and longitudinal study. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39*, 414–431.
- Armistead, L. D. (2014). Best practices in continuing professional development for school psychologists utilizing the NASP practice model. In P. L. Harrison & A. Thomas, (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology: Foundations* (pp. 611–626). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Balu, R., Zhu, P., Doolittle, F., Schiller, E., Jenkins, J., & Gersten, R. (2015). *Evaluation of response to intervention practices for elementary school reading*. NCEE 2016-4000. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Barrett, C. A., Cottrell, J. M., Newman, D. S., Pierce, B. G., & Anderson, A. (2015). Training school psychologists to identify Specific Learning Disabilities: A content analysis of syllabi. *School Psychology Review, 44*, 271–288.
- Barth, A. E., Stuebing, K. K., Anthony, J. L., Denton, C. A., Mathes, P. G., Fletcher, J. M., & Francis, D. J. (2008). Agreement among response to intervention criteria for identifying responder status. *Learning and Individual Differences, 18*(3), 296–307. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2008.04.004
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- Brown Waesche, J. S., Schatschneider, C., Maner, J. K., Ahmed, Y., & Wagner, R. K. (2011). Examining agreement and longitudinal stability among traditional and RTI-based definitions of reading disability using the affected-status agreement statistic. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 44*, 296–307. doi:10.1177/0022219410392048
- Burns, M. K., Appleton, J. J., & Stehouwer, J. D. (2005). Meta-analytic review of responsiveness-to-intervention research: Examining field-based and research-implemented models. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 23*(4), 381–394.
- Burns, M., & Gibbons, K. (2012). *Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools: Procedures to assure scientific-based practices* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Burns, M. K., Jacob, S., & Wagner, A. R. (2008). Ethical and legal issues associated with using response-to-intervention to assess learning disabilities. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 263–279.
- Burns, M. K., Maki, K. E., Warmbold-Brann, K., & Preast, J. L. (in press). Using student response to intervention to identify SLD: Requirements, recommendations, and future research. In D. P. Flanagan & V. C. Alfonso, (Eds.), *Essentials of specific learning disability identification*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Burns, M. K., Silberglitt, B., Christ, T. J., Gibbons, K. A., & Coolong-Chaffin, M. (2016). Using oral reading fluency to evaluate response to intervention and to identify students not making sufficient progress.

- In K. D. Cummings & Y. Petscher, (Eds.), *The fluency construct: Curriculum-based measurement concepts and applications* (pp. 123–140). New York, NY: Springer.
- Christ, T. J., & Arañas, Y. A. (2015). Best practices in problem analysis. In P. L. Harrison & A. Thomas, (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology: Data-based and collaborative decision making* (pp. 87–98). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Christ, T. J., Zopluoglu, C., Monaghan, B. D., & Van Norman, E. R. (2013). Curriculum-based measurement of oral reading: Multi-study evaluation of schedule, duration, and dataset quality on progress monitoring outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*, 19–57. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2012.11.001
- Crepeau-Hobson, F., & Sobel, D. M. (2010). School psychologists and RTI: Analysis of training and professional development needs. *School Psychology Forum, 4*, 22–32.
- Cromwell, R. L., Blashfield, R. K., & Strauss, J. S. (1975). Criteria for classification systems. In N. Hobbs, (Ed.), *Issues in the classification of children* (pp. 4–25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.
- Curtis, M. J., Castillo, J. M., & Gelley, C. (2012). School psychology 2010: Demographics, employment, and the context for professional practices—Part 1. *Communique, 40*(7), 1.
- Fletcher, J. M. (2012). Classification and identification of learning disabilities. In B. Wong & D. L. Butler, (Eds.), *Learning about learning disabilities* (4th ed., pp. 1–25). Waltham, MA: Academic Press.
- Gersten, R., Beckman, S., Clarke, B., Foegen, A., Marsh, L., Star, J. R., & Witzel, B. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to intervention (RTI) for elementary and middle schools*. (NCEE 2009-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>
- Hauerwas, L. B., Brown, R., & Scott, A. N. (2013). Specific learning disability and response to intervention: State level guidance. *Exceptional Children, 80*, 101–120.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108–446, 118 Stat. 2647; 2004 Enacted H.R. 1350; 108 Enacted H.R. 1350. Final regulations implementing IDEA 2004 were published in the Federal Register, Monday, August 14, 2006, pp. 46540–46845.
- Kavale, K. A., & Spaulding, L. S. (2008). Is response to intervention good policy for specific learning disability? *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 23*(4), 169–179. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2008.00274.x
- Kearns, D. M., & Fuchs, D. (2013). Does cognitively focused instruction improve the academic performance of low-achieving students? *Exceptional Children, 79*, 263–290.
- Kovaleski, J., VanDerHeyden, A. M., & Shapiro, E. S. (2013). *The RTI approach to evaluating learning disabilities*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Kratochwill, T. R. (2007). Preparing psychologists for evidence-based school practice: Lessons learned and challenges ahead. *American Psychologist, 62*, 843–843.
- Maki, K. E., Burns, M. K., & Sullivan, A. (2017). Learning disability identification consistency: The impact of methodology and student evaluation data. *School Psychology Quarterly, 32*, 254–267.
- Maki, K. E., Floyd, R. G., & Roberson, T. (2015). State learning disability eligibility criteria: A comprehensive review. *School Psychology Quarterly, 30*, 457–469. doi:10.1037/spq0000109
- Marston, D., Lau, M., Muyskens, P., & Wilson, J. (2016). Data-based decision-making, the problem-solving model, and response to intervention in the Minneapolis Public Schools. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden, (Eds.), *Handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of assessment and intervention* (pp. 677–692). New York, NY: Springer.
- McMaster, K. L., Parker, D., & Jung, P. G. (2012). Using curriculum-based measurement for beginning writers within a response to intervention framework. *Reading Psychology, 33*(1–2), 190–216. doi:10.1080/02702711.2012.631867
- Melby-Lurvig, M., & Hume, C. (2013). Is working memory training effective? A meta-analytic review. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 270–291.
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2010). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological services: NASP practice model overview*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). Children and youth with disabilities. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgg.asp
- Noell, G. H., & Gansle, K. A. (2016). Assuring the response to intervention process has substance: Assessing and supporting intervention implementation. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden, (Eds.), *Handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of multi-tiered systems of support* (2nd ed., pp. 407–420). New York, NY: Springer.

- Northwest Evaluation Association. (2003). *Measures of academic progress*. Lake Oswego, OR: Author.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, *41*(5), 673–690.
- Reschly, D. J. (2008). School psychology paradigm shift and beyond. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes, (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 3–15). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Rossen, E., Hayes, M. W., Prus, J., & Bowman, T. (2016). *Comparing Praxis® Performance Based on NASP Program Approval Status* [Research report]. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Salvia, J., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Bolt, S. (2012). *Assessment in special and inclusive education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Shapiro, E. S. (2016). Evaluating the impact of response to intervention in reading at the elementary level across the state of Pennsylvania. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden, (Eds.), *Handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of multitiered systems of support* (2nd ed., pp. 661–676). New York, NY: Springer.
- Shinn, M. R., & Brown, R. (2016). *Much ado about little: The dangers of disseminating the RTI outcome study without careful analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.rtinetwork.org/images/content/blog/rtiblog/shinn%20brown%20ies%20report%20review.pdf>
- Skiba, R. J., Simmons, A. B., Ritter, S., Gibb, A. C., Rausch, M. K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung, C. G. (2008). Achieving equity in special education: History, status, and current challenges. *Exceptional Children*, *74*, 264–288.
- Spectrum K-12 School Solutions. (2010). *Response to intervention adoption survey*. Towson, MD: Author.
- Stuebing, K. K., Fletcher, J. M., Branum-Martin, L., & Francis, D. J. (2012). Evaluation of the technical adequacy of three methods for identifying specific learning disabilities based on cognitive discrepancies. *School Psychology Review*, *41*, 3–22.
- Sullivan, A. L., & Long, L. (2010). Examining the changing landscape of school psychology practice: A survey of school-based practitioners regarding response to intervention. *Psychology in the Schools*, *47*, 1059–1070. doi:10.1002/pits.20524
- VanDerHeyden, A. M., Witt, J. C., & Gilbertson, D. (2007). A multi-year evaluation of the effects of a response to intervention (RTI) model on identification of children for special education. *Journal of School Psychology*, *45*, 225–256.
- Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. M. (2012). Response to intervention with secondary school students with reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *45*, 244–256.
- Vaughn, S., & Fuchs, L. S. (2003). Redefining learning disabilities as inadequate response to instruction: The promise and potential problems. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *18*(3), 137–146. doi:10.1111/1540-5826.00070
- Williams, B. B., & Monahan, L. W. (2015). Best practices in school psychologists' self-evaluation and documenting effectiveness. In P. L. Harrison & A. Thomas, (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology: Foundations* (pp. 581–598). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M., Dawson, P., Kelley, B., Morrison, D., Ortiz, S., & Telzrow, C. (2008). The blueprint for training and practice as the basis for best practices. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes, (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 37–69). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Kathrin E. Maki, PhD, NCSP, is an Assistant Professor in the Educational Psychology department at Ball State University. Her research interests include SLD identification practices and academic intervention and data-based decision-making within multitiered systems of support.