

Figure 5.4: Chart for Rating Our Effectiveness on Systematically Responding When Students Do and Don't Learn—Flirting, Dating, or Being Engaged?

Actions for Flirting With a PLC	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
1. We can't fit RTI into our school schedule, so after-school tutoring is our best option. Of course, the students who need it the most don't always show up.			
2. We use RTI primarily to identify students for special education services.			
3. Our grading practices make intervention opportunities not worth pursuing.			
4. We taught it. They didn't get it. So we let the intervention people deal with it.			
5. Our students get RTI time during specials and electives.			
6. We have not designated an intervention block or time in the master schedule for RTI.			
Actions for Dating a PLC	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
1. Our RTI model is great because it's a place where I can send students who are struggling to learn.			
2. Our RTI model focuses on our bubble students (those who are close to proficient).			
3. We "do" RTI, but we can't tell you if it's really working.			
4. We "do" RTI, but we don't have a comprehensive implementation plan.			

Actions for Dating a PLC	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
5. RTI at our school has more to do with adult paperwork than it does with helping students learn.			
6. At our school, we pull students out of math to get them caught up in math.			
7. RTI helps our school see what's wrong with the student.			
8. We focus many resources on administering and collecting assessment data rather than on helping staff learn to use the data.			
Actions for Being Engaged to a PLC*	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
1. We use evidence of student learning to identify students, by name and by need, by student and by standard, who require additional time and support for learning.			
2. We believe that no support system will compensate for bad teaching. "Schools characterized by weak and ineffective teaching will not solve their problems by creating a system of timely interventions for students. Eventually, that system will be crushed by the weight of the mass of students it's attempting to support (Du-Four et al., 2010, p. 111–112)."			
3. We use timely interventions. A student should not have to fail for months, quarters, semesters, or until state test results return in the fall to receive additional support. At least every three to four weeks there should be a systematic process to identify students in need of additional support.			

Actions for Being Engaged to a PLC*	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
<p>4. We use directive interventions. If the school's fundamental purpose is to ensure that all students learn, then students cannot be given the option of failure. A learning-focused school will not accept the narrative of "It is our job to teach, and the student's job to learn," or "We are preparing students for the real world, so requiring them to get help is enabling and will not teach them responsibility."</p>			
<p>5. We use an intervention model that reflects the unique context of our school. Schools should create their own plans rather than adopting the program of another school. The value is in the process, not simply mimicking an existing program from another school.</p>			
<p>6. We have a plan for enrichment. Every school has a specific plan to enrich and extend the learning of students who are not challenged by the required curriculum.</p>			
<p>7. We realize that more of the same is not effective intervention. Effective intervention is characterized by differentiation and precision. Intervention offers a setting and strategies that are different from those already proven to be ineffective for the student. An intervention system that only reports a student is failing in a subject will not be as effective as a system that can identify the specific skill or skills that are causing the student difficulty.</p>			

Actions for Being Engaged to a PLC*	Yes	No	As Evidenced By . . .
<p>8. We make sure students in need of additional support are never pulled from new direct instruction. Interventions must be in addition to core instruction—not in place of it. Pulling students from essential grade-level curriculum and replacing it with below-grade-level coursework is not an intervention—it is glorified tracking. The lowest-performing students will never catch up. Students taught below grade level every day will end up below grade level. To achieve the goal of additional support without pullout, the school will create flexible time in the master schedule to provide interventions during the school day. Every school must have a specific plan to ensure that students who experience initial difficulty in learning are provided with additional time and support for learning during the school day in a timely and directive way that does not cause the student to miss any new direct instruction.</p>			

**DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). Learning by doing: A handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press, pp. 111–112.*