

Pinellas County Schools Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) Evaluation

**Self-Assessment of Problem Solving
Implementation (SAPSI) ANALYSIS**

Research and Accountability

Pinellas County Schools



2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive summary | 4 |
| Pinellas County Schools Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) Evaluation: Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI) Analysis | 5 |
| Method..... | 5 |
| Results..... | 6 |
| Consensus | 6 |
| District level leadership provides active commitment and support (e.g., meets to review data and issues at least twice each year)..... | 7 |
| The school leadership provides training, support and active involvement (e.g., principal is actively involved in School-Based Leadership Team meetings)..... | 8 |
| Faculty/staff support and are actively involved with problem solving/RtI (e.g., one of the top 3 goals of the School Improvement Plan, 80% of faculty document support, 3-year timeline for implementation available)... 8 | 8 |
| A School-Based Leadership Team is established and represents the roles of an administrator, facilitator, data mentor, content specialist, parent, and teachers from representative areas (e.g., general ed., special ed.) | 9 |
| Data are collected (e.g., beliefs survey, satisfaction survey) to assess level of commitment and impact of PS/RtI on faculty/staff. | 10 |
| Consensus Summary | 15 |
| Infrastructure Development: Data Usage..... | 16 |
| Schoolwide data (e.g., DIBELS, Curriculum Based Measures, Office Discipline Referrals) are collected through an efficient and effective systematic process..... | 16 |
| Statewide and other databases (e.g., Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network [PMRN], School-Wide Information System [SWIS]) are used to make data-based decisions..... | 17 |
| School-wide data are presented to staff after each benchmarking session (e.g., staff meeting, team meetings, grade-level meetings). | 18 |
| School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic programs. | 18 |
| School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs. | 18 |
| Curriculum-Based Measurement (e.g., DIBELS) data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for academics. | 19 |
| Office Disciplinary Referral data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for behavior..... | 19 |
| Data are used to evaluate the effectiveness (RtI) of Tier 2 intervention programs. | 20 |
| Individual student data are utilized to determine response to Tier 3 interventions..... | 20 |
| Data Usage Summary | 24 |
| Infrastructure Development: Special Education Eligibility | 25 |
| Special Education Eligibility determination is made using the RtI model for Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (EBD)..... | 25 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Special Education Eligibility determination is made using the RtI model for Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD)..... | 25 |
| Special Education Eligibility Summary..... | 29 |
| Infrastructure Development: Selection of Evidence-Based Practices | 30 |
| The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices: Tier 1..... | 30 |
| The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices: Tier 2..... | 31 |
| The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices: Tier 3..... | 31 |
| Selection of Evidence-Based Practices Summary..... | 35 |
| Infrastructure Development: School-Based Leadership Team activity..... | 36 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team has a regular meeting schedule for problem-solving activities..... | 36 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team evaluates target student's/students' RtI at regular meetings..... | 36 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team involves parents..... | 37 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team has regularly scheduled data day meetings to evaluate Tier 1 and Tier 2 data..... | 38 |
| SBLT Infrastructure Development Summary | 41 |
| Implementation: Three-Tiered System of Service Delivery | 43 |
| Tier 1 Academic Core Instruction clearly identified | 43 |
| Tier 1 Behavioral Core Instruction clearly identified..... | 44 |
| Tier 2 Academic Supplemental Instruction/Program clearly identified..... | 44 |
| Tier 2 Behavioral Supplemental Instruction/Program clearly identified..... | 45 |
| Tier 3 Academic Intensive Strategies/Program are evidence-based..... | 45 |
| Tier 3 Behavioral Intensive Strategies/Program are evidence-based | 46 |
| Three-Tiered System of Service Delivery Summary | 53 |
| Implementation: Effective Problem Solving Procedures..... | 54 |
| Problem is defined as a data-based discrepancy (GAP Analysis) between what is expected and what is occurring (includes peer and benchmark data)..... | 54 |
| Replacement behaviors (e.g., reading performance targets, homework completion targets) are clearly identified..... | 55 |
| Problem analysis is conducted using available data and evidence-based hypotheses..... | 55 |
| Intervention plans include evidence-based (e.g., research-based, data-based) strategies..... | 55 |
| Intervention support personnel are identified and scheduled for all interventions..... | 56 |
| Intervention integrity is documented..... | 56 |
| Response to intervention is evaluated through systematic data collection..... | 57 |
| Changes are made to intervention based on student response..... | 57 |
| Parents are routinely involved in implementation of interventions..... | 57 |
| Effective Problem Solving Summary | 61 |
| Implementation: School-Based Leadership Team activity..... | 63 |
| A strategic plan (implementation plan) exists and is used by the School-Based Leadership Team to guide implementation of PS/RtI..... | 63 |

| | |
|---|----|
| The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year to review data and implementation issues. | 64 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year with the District Leadership Team to review data and implementation issues. | 64 |
| Changes are made to the implementation plan as a result of school and district leadership team data-based decisions. | 64 |
| Feedback on the outcomes of the PS/RtI Project is provided to school-based faculty and staff at least yearly. | 65 |
| SBLT Implementation Summary | 69 |
| Total SAPSI items Achieved with Subscales by School | 70 |
| Conclusions/Recommendations | 75 |
| Has Implementation improved during the course of the 2010-2011 school year? | 75 |
| Is there a range of Implementation levels or are all schools close together in terms of their implementation level? | 75 |
| Have the pilot schools implemented the PS/RtI framework effectively? | 75 |
| Are there differences in implementation across grade levels? | 75 |
| What goals should be achieved during the 2011-2012 school year? | 75 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation examines results of the Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI). This 43 item-scale was completed by 118 schools across Pinellas County in both the Fall and the Spring of the 2010-2011 school year. This scale, completed by School-Based Leadership Teams, examines the degree to which Consensus, Infrastructure Development, and Implementation processes are occurring in accord with the PS/Rtl framework.

Responses are examined to provide answers to six evaluation questions.

1. Has Implementation improved during the course of the 2010-2011 school year?
2. Is there a range of Implementation levels or are all schools close together in terms of their implementation level?
3. Have the pilot schools implemented the PS/Rtl framework effectively?
4. Are there differences in implementation across grade levels?
5. What goals should be achieved during the 2011-2012 school year?

Results indicate that implementation levels have improved during the course of the 2010-2011 school year. There is a wide range of implementation levels across schools, with pilot schools among those providing the highest ratings. Elementary schools provide higher ratings in general than do middle and high schools.

Detailed analysis of each SAPSI item provides the foundation for recommended implementation goals for the 2011-2012 school year. Analysis also provides insights concerning processes that may assist schools in the development and achievement of these. Both goals and processes to achieve them are summarized in the conclusions and recommendations section.

SAPSI results are intended to be a foundation that can help guide implementation going forward. District leadership and individual schools can examine results to highlight areas of need and plan for future implementation steps. Doing so can facilitate accomplishment of the district's goal of having a strong PS/Rtl framework implemented in each school districtwide.

PINELLAS COUNTY SCHOOLS PROBLEM SOLVING/RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (PS/RTI) EVALUATION: SELF-ASSESSMENT OF PROBLEM SOLVING IMPLEMENTATION (SAPSI) ANALYSIS

This evaluation examines implementation of the PS/RtI framework in the Pinellas County School District. Detailed analysis of the Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI) is utilized to accomplish this goal. This measure was completed by School-Based Leadership Teams districtwide in both the Fall and Spring of the 2010-2011 school year. Five evaluation questions are addressed. They are:

1. Has Implementation improved during the course of the 2010-2011 school year?
2. Is there a range of Implementation levels or are all schools close together in terms of their implementation level?
3. Have the pilot schools implemented the PS/RtI framework effectively?
4. Are there differences in implementation across grade levels?
5. What goals should be achieved during the 2011-2012 school year?

The first four questions are summative. They are intended to evaluate progress to date districtwide. They are intended to gauge the degree to which improvement has occurred and to examine areas of strength and weakness in implementation processes. Broad answers to these four questions should be known to those working closely with the project. Analysis in this evaluation should provide an in-depth examination of each of these questions that enhances our understanding and guides further improvements in processes.

The last question is formative. Goals are intended to present ways that these data can be used to guide improvement in implementation moving forward. Responses to individual items are examined with respect to progress that has been made and what progress we can expect in the coming year. Through doing so, this evaluation can be used as a working document by schools to focus attention upon:

1. The current status of implementation of the PS/RtI framework
2. What goals can be set at the school level in the coming year
3. What can be done to achieve these goals

METHOD

SAPSI results are presented in eight subsections. Results for individual items sharing common themes are presented together. The eight themes include Consensus building, Data usage, Special Education eligibility, School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) Infrastructure development, the Academic and Behavioral Three-Tiered intervention framework, Problem-Solving activities, and SBLT Implementation items.

All SAPSI Items are rated as either:

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Not Started | The activity occurs less than 24% of the time |
| In Progress | The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time |
| Achieved | The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time |
| Maintaining | The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time. |

- 1) For each subsection, individual item responses are examined with particular attention to the percentage of schools rating each item as either Achieved or Maintaining in the Spring administration. Doing so allows us to examine how successful implementation has been districtwide.

- 2) Comments submitted by schools in accord with each item are analyzed and discussed to better understand both favorable and unfavorable outcomes.
- 3) The total number of items rated as Achieved or Maintaining per school are then examined. For example, there are five Consensus items. This section of the analysis examines how many schools Achieved all five items, how many Achieved four of the five, and so on. Doing so allows an estimate of progress in each of the eight subsections across the district as a whole.
- 4) Finally, the number of items rated as either Achieved or Maintaining are presented for each of the 118 schools. Doing so allows both district and school personnel to examine progress for each school relative to all schools in the district. As we will see, for each subsection examined there is a self-reported continuum of implementation across schools. Some schools rate themselves as having achieved successful implementation across many items, whereas other schools rate themselves as having not achieved many items. At the conclusion of this report the subscale and total scores for each school are presented. This analysis highlights the continuum of implementation across schools as rated by each school’s SBLT members. It is important to keep in mind that all ratings are based upon a self-assessment and results of an observation-based measure may differ. Nonetheless these self-ratings provide useful information to answer each of the evaluation questions in this report and serve as a foundation upon which to assess implementation at each school by those working at each school.

RESULTS

CONSENSUS

| Table 1: Consensus | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| District level leadership provides active commitment and support (e.g., meets to review data and issues at least twice each year). | Fall | 27 | 23.1% | 64 | 54.7% | 19 | 16.2% | 7 | 6.0% | 117 |
| | Spring | 11 | 9.4% | 37 | 31.6% | 50 | 42.7% | 19 | 16.2% | 117 |
| The school leadership provides training, support and active involvement (e.g., principal is actively involved in School-Based Leadership Team meetings). | Fall | 8 | 6.8% | 46 | 39.0% | 53 | 44.9% | 11 | 9.3% | 118 |
| | Spring | 2 | 1.7% | 33 | 28.2% | 44 | 37.6% | 38 | 32.5% | 117 |
| Faculty/staff support and are actively involved with problem solving/Rtl (e.g., one of the top 3 goals of the School Improvement Plan, 80% of faculty document support, 3-year timeline for implementation available). | Fall | 16 | 13.7% | 89 | 76.1% | 10 | 8.5% | 2 | 1.7% | 117 |
| | Spring | 7 | 5.9% | 81 | 68.6% | 22 | 18.6% | 8 | 6.8% | 118 |
| A School-Based Leadership Team is established and represents the roles of an administrator, facilitator, data mentor, content specialist, parent, and teachers from representative areas (e.g., general ed., special ed.) | Fall | 6 | 5.1% | 60 | 50.8% | 43 | 36.4% | 9 | 7.6% | 118 |
| | Spring | 2 | 1.7% | 50 | 42.4% | 43 | 36.4% | 23 | 19.5% | 118 |
| Data are collected (e.g., beliefs survey, satisfaction survey) to assess level of commitment and impact of PS/Rtl on faculty/staff. | Fall | 58 | 49.6% | 46 | 39.3% | 10 | 8.5% | 3 | 2.6% | 117 |
| | Spring | 28 | 23.9% | 51 | 43.6% | 26 | 22.2% | 12 | 10.3% | 117 |

The SAPSI contains five Consensus items. The percentage of schools rating each item as either Achieved or Maintaining increased from the Fall to the Spring administration. This pattern will be evident across almost all items on the SAPSI. The increase in percentage of Achieved or Maintaining ratings across items provides evidence that implementation of the PS/RTI framework has improved during the 2010-2011 school year.

Differences exist across items in the degree to which increases in Achievement levels occurred across the school year. Differences also exist in the percentage of schools rating each item as Achieved or Maintaining. Both of these factors are considered with respect to each item. Analysis of comments submitted with respect to each item is presented to better understand these results.

DISTRICT LEVEL LEADERSHIP PROVIDES ACTIVE COMMITMENT AND SUPPORT (E.G., MEETS TO REVIEW DATA AND ISSUES AT LEAST TWICE EACH YEAR).

The number of schools rating this item as having been Achieved or Maintained increased from 26 in the Fall to 69 in the Spring. Comments highlighted the provision of multiple SBLT training sessions and resources to satisfy this component.

- *District team has attended 4 SBLT meetings this year.*
- *District level leadership teams meet regularly and have goals related to PS/RTI. The district has developed an implementation plan that includes professional development, involvement, resources, and instructional practices*

Some comments highlighted the provision of individual school-based assistance.

- *The district has attended at least 5 of our meetings!*

While an increase in support from district leadership was evident, a total of 58.9% of schools rated this component as having been Achieved or Maintained by the Spring. Successful provision of district level support is essential to the process of building an effective framework at each school. This is the first item of the scale, and should be the first component of the framework to reach a 100% achievement level.

Some schools acknowledged receipt of support during trainings, but felt that this support did not meet their individual needs.

- *District level meetings were held 4 times this year. The focus of the meetings was not where we are in the project.*
- *The district level team can do a better job of working with schools on the RTI process*
- *SBLT participates in the district level training; however a district staff has not visited the school.*
- *could use more support and understand will have via RTI Rebecca Sarlo--very excited about this help*

Two of the schools rating this item as Not Started stated:

- *Who should be doing this?*

There appears to be a range of individual school level involvement by district leadership. For the coming year, district level staff can identify all schools rating this item as Not Started or In Progress and contact those schools to determine the steps necessary to reach a level of Achieved for this component.

Additional topics to consider based upon comments were:

- *It would be helpful if the district gave more directives specific to fundamental schools regarding implementation of RtI. For example, fundamental schools have policies that contradict PBS, so, how are those two issues supposed to be solved.*
- *RTI trainings- at least 4 this year. the number of surveys from district leadership that schools have to complete is too much*
- *More TDEs are needed so that more members of the team are able to attend.*

THE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PROVIDES TRAINING, SUPPORT AND ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT (E.G., PRINCIPAL IS ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETINGS).

The number of schools rating this item as having been Achieved or Maintained increased from 64 in the Fall to 82 in the Spring. This was the highest rated of the Consensus items with 70.1%¹ of schools rating this component as having been Achieved. Successful schools highlighted a process whereby information concerning PS/RtI is shared throughout the school.

- *In October, the SBLT team provided training and continues to provide ongoing assistance through PLC's. Administration is present at all SBLT meetings.*
- *SBLT team meets on a weekly basis with the majority of the team members in attendance. The team has provided question and answer sessions through PLC's. In addition, the SBLT includes teachers and has had teachers in attendance at the PS/RtI trainings*
- *SBLT team members provided presentations regarding level of implementation of RTI:A & RTI:B for each school level team. Data is shared at staff meetings.*
- *The school leadership team plans, implements and monitors the progress of school improvement. PS/RTI is implemented as a school-wide method of raising student achievement. School leadership ensures time for professional Learning Communities (PLC) to meet*

Where this component was rated as In Progress or Not Achieved, schools cited a less clearly defined process of information transmission or poor follow-through.

- *Need more staff and school wide trainings in the SBLT process that will in turn increase staff involvement. SBLT has strong leadership involvement.*
- *Team is established and trainings were scheduled to support Problem solving; however, planned school-wide activities/trainings have only occurred about 50% of the time (time restraints during staff meetings, agenda full).*
- *Only one assistant principal is involved.*

There appear to be several schools in the district that have established an efficient means of sharing information related to PS/RtI- perhaps as high as 70%. These can be used as a template to help schools who have not yet achieved this component. District staff can examine which schools have not achieved this component and advise or re-emphasize effective processes for them.

FACULTY/STAFF SUPPORT AND ARE ACTIVELY INVOLVED WITH PROBLEM SOLVING/RTI (E.G., ONE OF THE TOP 3 GOALS OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN, 80% OF FACULTY DOCUMENT SUPPORT, 3-YEAR TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION AVAILABLE).

The number of schools rating this item as having been Achieved or Maintained increased from 12 in the Fall to 30 in the Spring. A total of 25.4% of schools rated this item as Achieved/Maintained in the Spring, which is the lowest percentage among all Consensus items.

¹ This is the percentage of schools who responded (N =117). This convention is used throughout this report. It is not a percentage out of 118 in cases where not all schools completed an item.

Achievement of this component appears to come at a later stage in development of the PS/RtI framework. Schools that have Not Started or are In Progress for this component document how the SBLT is just beginning to understand/develop the PS/RtI framework.

- *The School Based Leadership Team is still learning, particularly the academic problem solving/RtI and how it relates to the revolving and constantly changing population of the school.*
- *We need to provide more professional development to staff. We spent most of this year organizing interventions and data collection/maintenance systems- now that we have a better grasp on our implementation processes we feel better prepared to share with staff*
- *Problem Solving/ RTI is not discussed with the faculty.*

The next step occurs when faculty become more involved in the process and increase buy-in.

- *Faculty and Staff are working through the ongoing understanding of RTI. When teachers have experience with Tiered Interventions and they see success they become more accepting and open to the process. These teachers then become advocates for the process*

Eventually, this becomes a way of work for the whole staff.

- *Faculty has changed their understanding and buy in towards RTI*
- *We have looked at our Tier II A & B processes with staff to PDSA for 2-years. We have been an active PBS school for over 6 years.*
- *PS/RtI is included on the School Improvement Plan. Staff are involved in problem solving through data chats every 6 weeks of the tier 2 interventions. Teachers are also involved in tier 3 problem solving for individual students.*
- *Evidence in PLCs, faculty meetings and SBLT meetings. Teachers/support staff are actively involved in review of Tier 1 data and Tier 2 data. Tier 3 data is reviewed through the Tier 3 problem solving process.*

Achievement of this component should improve in the coming year. 100% Achievement of this component will likely take more than one year. Inclusion on the SIP can be accomplished by all schools. A timeline for implementation can be accomplished by all schools. Faculty support will only occur, though, once the framework is in place and faculty are actively involved in its development and maintenance.

A SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM IS ESTABLISHED AND REPRESENTS THE ROLES OF AN ADMINISTRATOR, FACILITATOR, DATA MENTOR, CONTENT SPECIALIST, PARENT, AND TEACHERS FROM REPRESENTATIVE AREAS (E.G., GENERAL ED., SPECIAL ED.)

There was a small increase from 52 to 66 schools rating this item as Achieved/Maintaining from the Fall to the Spring. Overall 55.9% of schools rated this item as Achieved/Maintaining in the Spring.

Comments suggest that schools may have a SBLT established, but may not have a representative from all areas. Parent and teacher representation were often cited as missing.

- *Our goal for next school year is to clearly define and assign team roles. Representatives from all areas (EBD, ET, PRE-K, middle and high school) are needed to better balance input and have more diverse points of view.*
- *Representation includes: Principal, Reading Coach, VE Specialist, Behavior Specialist, School Psychologist and Social Work; two areas not represented are a classroom teacher and parent.*

- *An SBLT exists and meets. However, there are no parents or teachers on the team. The Reading Coach serves as both the data mentor and the content specialist. We have only had an Academic Diagnostician for the last 2 weeks, and she is only here on Friday*

Comments requested clarification concerning confidentiality when parents are included. Comments suggested difficulty including teachers due to scheduling.

- *Parents - What about confidentiality? Teachers - What about scheduling around their classroom commitments?*
- *We are looking at changing the time we meet next year so that teachers can consistently participate on our team. Still need guidance in adding a parent to our team.*

Schools rating themselves as Achieved/Maintaining cited communication among the SBLT, SAC, and PTA as means of including parents.

- *Membership and roles are defined. PTA and SAC are involved and supported of the positive behavior support plans.*
- *Roles of the SBLT are established and recorded at the top of the meeting agenda. Members of the team are also members of SAC and relay information at least once per year to SAC through the School Improvement Plan. ESE teachers were in attendance to one*

Overall, the minimal change in Achievement of this component across the school year appears to be associated with difficulty including parents and classroom teachers in the SBLT. District leadership should provide guidance to schools concerning how this may be accomplished. Schools who have successfully integrated teachers and parents into the SBLT can be cited as models for other schools who must problem solve confidentiality issues and time constraints.

Also, some schools cited this component as Achieved even without parent representation whereas others did not. There was some unreliability in the data in this regard. Clarification regard parent and teacher involvement should reduce reliability concerns for this item during future administrations of the SAPSI.

DATA ARE COLLECTED (E.G., BELIEFS SURVEY, SATISFACTION SURVEY) TO ASSESS LEVEL OF COMMITMENT AND IMPACT OF PS/RTI ON FACULTY/STAFF.

There was an increase from 13 to 36 schools rating this item as Achieved/Maintaining from the Fall to the Spring administration of the SAPSI. 32.5% of schools rated this item as Achieved/Maintaining in the Spring.

None of the comments provided by schools cited means through which surveys are used for planning or progress monitoring. Those who rated this item as Achieved/Maintaining would state that the survey was completed, but not how it was used.

- *Multiple surveys, both academic and behavior, have been completed throughout the year.*
- *Collected monthly prior to Rtl meeting.*
- *Have completed for the past 3 years and spring of this year*
- *Perception of skills survey was administered through Survey Monkey to all staff with 100% of staff completing the survey.*
- *district survey forwarded to staff*
- *A survey will be delivered at the beginning of next year*

Others cited difficulty obtaining a strong response rate.

- *39 Beliefs Surveys were distributed this school year with 4 returned complete*

- *These surveys met with frustration due to overwhelming amounts of teacher related paper work and this they felt during this year of change to Reading Units of Study was too burdensome. We will try again next year when the transitions of major grade change*

Some cited means through which surveys were planned for the coming year to inform the implementation of PS/RtI

- *Data is collected in small groups looking at their academic data to make next step decisions Surveys are conducted with targeted groups or with a specific focus Next steps will be to look at schoolwide impact of data and share data with whole faculty*
- *Survey collected 1 time this year; SBLT team needs to restructure the survey to target areas for refresher training.*
- *Survey written and discussed-will finalize in fall of 2011*

This component represents another area where significant improvement is necessary. A Beliefs Survey is planned to be administered in the Fall of 2011. A Perceptions of Skills survey had been administered in the Spring of 2011 with a poor response rate. To be useful at the school level, these surveys must have a strong response rate. Having “4 returned complete” was the norm for the Perceptions Survey.

The data from the SAPSI analysis in this report suggest that schools are at widely varying levels of development of the PS/RtI framework district-wide. Involvement of teachers in the process appears to come after the SBLTs have set up a solid framework. Schools where PS/RtI is not a ‘way of work’ yet do not have the buy-in necessary for teachers to complete the surveys. There is also minimal evidence concerning what is done with the survey results once they are received. If a Beliefs survey is administered without active SBLT and principal support to achieve a strong response rate and use the data that is obtained, then the response rate will be poor for schools where the PS/RtI framework is not established. District leadership may wish to administer this scale only at schools that request administration of the scale, then work with all other schools to develop means through which the Beliefs scale may be used. After this training has occurred, the scale can be administered.

| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | Total N |
|--------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|---|------|------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | |
| Fall | 40 | 33.9% | 29 | 24.6% | 25 | 21.2% | 13 | 11.0% | 6 | 5.1% | 5 | 4.2% | 118 |
| Spring | 10 | 8.5% | 25 | 21.2% | 28 | 23.7% | 24 | 20.3% | 23 | 19.5% | 8 | 6.8% | 118 |

Overall, eight schools in the Spring rated all 5 Consensus items as either Achieved or Maintaining. In the Fall, 40 schools had not rated any of the five as Achieved/Maintaining. This number dropped to 10 in the Spring. Consensus, as measured by these five items has increased from the Fall to the Spring. However, there is still significant room for improvement.

The table below indicates the number of Consensus items rated as Achieved/Maintaining by school. The mean was 2.42 out of 5 items rated as Achieved/Maintained. Those schools above the mean are in green, those below the mean are colored red. This is the convention used for each section.

Three trends are clear in these data and will repeat across each section in this report. First, the pilot schools usually rated most or all items as Achieved/Maintained. Five of the six pilot schools rated either 4 or 5 Consensus items as Achieved/Maintained. This indicates that attainment of each component can occur given a sufficient investment of time and resources.

Second, elementary schools were much more likely than middle or high schools to rate items as having been Achieved/Maintained. Given that all of the pilot schools were elementary schools, it is likely that the district and the PS/RtI project leaders must pay increased attention to the development of the PS/RtI framework at the middle and high school levels.

Third, large changes can occur during a school year in the degree to which items are rated as Achieved. For example, Curlew Creek Elementary had rated no Consensus items as Achieved in the Fall, yet all were rated as Achieved in the Spring. This suggests that significant self-ratings of improvements can occur for schools who are currently at lower levels of Achievement of the PS/RtI framework.

| Table 3: Total Consensus items Achieved by School | | |
|---|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Bauder Elementary ² | 4 | 5 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Blanton Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 0 | 5 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Northwest Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 3 | 5 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 4 | 5 |
| Anona Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Bayside High | 4 | 4 |
| Belcher Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Belleair Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 1 | 4 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Nina Harris | 4 | 4 |
| North Shore Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 4 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Osceola Middle | 1 | 4 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Seminole High | 5 | 4 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 5 | 4 |

² Pilot schools are highlighted in light blue.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Starkey Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 0 | 4 |
| Azalea Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 3 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Frontier Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Gibbs High | 5 | 3 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 3 | 3 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 3 | 3 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Maximo Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 4 | 3 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Ozona Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 2 | 3 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| San Jose Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Seminole Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| St. Petersburg High | 1 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 1 | 3 |
| Boca Ciega High | 2 | 2 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 1 | 2 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 2 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Hamilton Disston | 3 | 2 |
| High Point Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Largo High | 0 | 2 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 0 | 2 |
| Melrose Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| New Heights Elementary | 3 | 2 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Orange Grove Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Osceola High | 3 | 2 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Perkins Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Plumb Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 2 | 2 |
| Tyrone Middle | 2 | 2 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Westgate Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Azalea Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Bay Point Middle | 3 | 1 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 1 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 1 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 1 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Lynch Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 1 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 2 | 1 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 2 | 1 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Seminole Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Skyview Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 2 | 1 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 0 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 2 | 0 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 1 | 0 |

| | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 2 | 0 |
| Total Mean | 1.42 | 2.42 |

CONSENSUS SUMMARY

Results indicate that district leadership provided at least 4 trainings to SBLTs that served to improve implementation and met the needs of several schools. Data suggest that some schools require more intensive individualized support from district leadership. These schools can be identified by reviewing comments submitted in response to this first SAPSI item as well as by reviewing scores across all SAPSI items presented at the end of this report. Through doing so, schools with lower levels of implementation can be targeted for more individualized assistance. This is a core item that must be Achieved at 100% in the coming year.

Results indicate that 70.1% of schools state that school leadership provides training, support, and active involvement. Several schools cited efficient means through which information is shared schoolwide. These schools can be used as a model for other schools that require improvement in these processes. This is a component that should increase as schools receive more assistance and practice with implementing the PS/Rtl framework.

Only 25.4% of schools indicated that faculty/staff support and are actively involved with problem solving. Having a strong SBLT-led core framework is likely a prerequisite for eliciting strong faculty support. For the coming year, it is essential for 100% of schools to develop a timeline for implementation and to include PS/Rtl goals on the SIP. As core processes become more defined, SBLTs can elicit support and involvement of faculty. Achievement of this component should improve in the coming year and all schools should have a timeline for implementation outlined on the SIP.

Regular meetings by a school-based leadership team are an essential component necessary for building the PS/Rtl framework. Schools require guidance concerning confidentiality issues with respect to inclusion of parents on the SBLT. Schools can also benefit from replicating models in which SBLTs communicate effectively with SACs and PTAs. This should be a focus of future training. For the coming year, all schools must have a SBLT that meets regularly, preferably weekly.

Only 32.5% of schools state that data are collected to assess the impact of PS/Rtl on faculty/staff. Improvement is necessary in the degree to which data are used to inform development of the PS/Rtl framework. This report must be used as a working document to highlight areas where each school requires improvement, to set goals, and to monitor achievement of goals. Similarly, a beliefs scale must be used actively to inform PS/Rtl development. If a Beliefs scale is administered in the Fall with a minimal response rate, it will have no utility at the school level. Leadership must decide whether to administer this scale to schools who request it to inform development of their framework.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT: DATA USAGE

| Table 4: Infrastructure Development: Data Usage | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Schoolwide data (e.g., DIBELS, Curriculum Based Measures, Office Discipline Referrals) are collected through an efficient and effective systematic process. | Fall | 6 | 5.1% | 52 | 44.1% | 51 | 43.2% | 9 | 7.6% | 118 |
| | Spring | 3 | 2.6% | 25 | 21.4% | 53 | 45.3% | 36 | 30.8% | 117 |
| Statewide and other databases (e.g., Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network [PMRN], School-Wide Information System [SWIS]) are used to make data-based decisions. | Fall | 6 | 5.1% | 59 | 50.4% | 43 | 36.8% | 9 | 7.7% | 117 |
| | Spring | 3 | 2.6% | 28 | 23.9% | 48 | 41.0% | 38 | 32.5% | 117 |
| School-wide data are presented to staff after each benchmarking session (e.g., staff meeting, team meetings, grade-level meetings). | Fall | 17 | 14.4% | 54 | 45.8% | 40 | 33.9% | 7 | 5.9% | 118 |
| | Spring | 7 | 6.0% | 46 | 39.3% | 36 | 30.8% | 28 | 23.9% | 117 |
| School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic programs. | Fall | 20 | 16.9% | 53 | 44.9% | 38 | 32.2% | 7 | 5.9% | 118 |
| | Spring | 9 | 7.7% | 42 | 35.9% | 38 | 32.5% | 28 | 23.9% | 117 |
| School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs. | Fall | 21 | 17.8% | 65 | 55.1% | 26 | 22.0% | 6 | 5.1% | 118 |
| | Spring | 13 | 11.1% | 56 | 47.9% | 31 | 26.5% | 17 | 14.5% | 117 |
| Curriculum-Based Measurement (e.g., DIBELS) data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for academics. | Fall | 7 | 6.0% | 52 | 44.4% | 48 | 41.0% | 10 | 8.5% | 117 |
| | Spring | 8 | 6.8% | 35 | 29.7% | 41 | 34.7% | 34 | 28.8% | 118 |
| Office Disciplinary Referral data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for behavior. | Fall | 17 | 14.4% | 68 | 57.6% | 27 | 22.9% | 6 | 5.1% | 118 |
| | Spring | 9 | 7.6% | 58 | 49.2% | 34 | 28.8% | 17 | 14.4% | 118 |
| Data are used to evaluate the effectiveness (Rtl) of Tier 2 intervention programs. | Fall | 28 | 23.9% | 54 | 46.2% | 31 | 26.5% | 4 | 3.4% | 117 |
| | Spring | 16 | 13.7% | 46 | 39.3% | 37 | 31.6% | 18 | 15.4% | 117 |
| Individual student data are utilized to determine response to Tier 3 interventions. | Fall | 12 | 10.2% | 38 | 32.2% | 56 | 47.5% | 12 | 10.2% | 118 |
| | Spring | 5 | 4.3% | 18 | 15.4% | 48 | 41.0% | 46 | 39.3% | 117 |

The number of schools rating all items as Achieved/Maintained increased from the Fall to the Spring. 76.1% of schools report that they are collecting schoolwide data through an efficient and systematic process. The degree to which data is then used to make data-based decisions varies across items. Particular assistance appears necessary to help schools use data to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs. Specific results with respect to each item are discussed below.

SCHOOLWIDE DATA (E.G., DIBELS, CURRICULUM BASED MEASURES, OFFICE DISCIPLINE REFERRALS) ARE COLLECTED THROUGH AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEMATIC PROCESS.

The number of schools collecting schoolwide data through an efficient and effective systematic process increased from 60 to 89 schools for a total of 76.1% reporting this item as Achieved/Maintained. Many of the comments cited the usage of specific data systems. Several schools reported that their means of data collection was a strength. These schools can be cited as examples for the 23.9% who have not Achieved this component.

- *Data (FAIR, Tier 2 PM, Tier 3 PM, ODR, Behavior Incident Reports) are all graphed regularly and shared with staff at least 3 times throughout the year.*
- *Data is collected on detention and is shared with staff and parents. FCAT (4th Writing, 3rd Grade Reading and Math) results are shared in a timely manner. Progress monitoring data is shared with teachers and parents.*
- *Through FAIR, tier 2 data collection, and tier 3 data collection, students are assessed at least bi-weekly. Teachers and support staff are aware of their responsibilities of data collection and complete it consistently in a timely fashion.*
- *Data is collected through common assessment cycles, ongoing progress monitoring at Tier 2 using FAIR OPM and Aimsweb, and ongoing progress monitoring at Tier 3 using Aimsweb weekly.*
- *We rock at this!!!*

Some schools require further help to develop effective data systems

- *Data is only collected through portal.*
- *The SBLT reviews data periodically, but not in a systematic process.*
- *Academically we have a process. As far as Discipline Referrals it is still a work in progress with our goal having been to institute a defined process with specific steps at the beginning of School year 2011-2012.*

The effective collection of schoolwide data is a central component that can be Achieved at a 100% level districtwide by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

STATEWIDE AND OTHER DATABASES (E.G., PROGRESS MONITORING AND REPORTING NETWORK [PMRN], SCHOOL-WIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM [SWIS]) ARE USED TO MAKE DATA-BASED DECISIONS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 52 to 86 schools for a total of 73.5%. While many schools report use of specific data systems, it is not clear from the comments whether these systems are used effectively to make data based decisions.

- *We use the data to best determine the needs of the student.*
- *Using various data sources across academic instructional areas to make data-based decision on student achievement.*
- *PMRN data is reviewed in PLCs as well as informal data chats about individual students.*
- *All staff have access to and are provided with data that pertains to the students they work with. Processes and further training is needed to improve the use of data and making data-based decisions.*

Other schools cited more systematized data based decision making processes.

- *PMRN is used to group students at Tier 2 for academics.*
- *We don't use SWIS, but information collected through the PMRN is used after each assessment period to make decisions*
- *Every year the school uses data to place students in reading classes. Students are not placed into math classes based on data. We use ODR data for Tier II beh. support plans.*

As we work to assure that 100% of schools have a data system in place during 2011-2012 we can further examine the degree to which these systems are used to make data-based decisions.

SCHOOL-WIDE DATA ARE PRESENTED TO STAFF AFTER EACH BENCHMARKING SESSION (E.G., STAFF MEETING, TEAM MEETINGS, GRADE-LEVEL MEETINGS).

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 47 to 64 schools for a total of 54.7%. Those who report having Achieved this item often cited the sharing of data at faculty meetings and PLCs.

- *School-wide data is reviewed at faculty meetings and grade level PLCs.*
- *Consistently reviewed with staff in PLC's*
- *Data is presented at weekly PLC meetings*
- *Data is presented in PLC's, faculty meetings, and trainings sessions with instructional coaches*

Those who do report this item as Achieved often cite lack of a systemized process for presenting data to staff.

- *Data used in an as-needed basis, no consistent analysis of data and sharing on a regular basis.*
- *Data has been shared with staff but not on a regular basis.*
- *Not enough time at staff meeting and only meet once a month*
- *We would like to accomplish this more often.*

This is an area where district leadership can support schools' development of a systematic data sharing process.

SCHOOL-WIDE DATA ARE USED TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 45 to 66 schools for a total of 56.4%. Again there was variability in the degree to which schools appeared comfortable with the degree to which they had a systemized process to analyze data. Some articulated a clear connection between data and evaluation.

- *Data are used to place students in reading programs and math levels. Students are also moved according to assessment data throughout the year*
- *Use common assessments to analyze questions and re-teach skills not mastered. Also use data to address key areas of need on the School Improvement Plan.*
- *School data reflects 80% or more students have achieved benchmark goals in all core academic programs.*

Other schools noted a need to develop a more systemized means of data analysis.

- *Our SBLT team is working on improving our process to evaluate our data more frequently.*
- *The school uses data, but this is not done at the SBLT meetings. It is a sub-committee and it's more informal.*
- *We have not started using data to evaluate the effectiveness of academic programs.*

SCHOOL-WIDE DATA ARE USED TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORE BEHAVIOR PROGRAMS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 32 to 48 schools for a total of 41%. Data throughout the SAPSI suggests that PS/Rtl for behavior lags behind its use for academic progress. This difference is reflected in the percentage of schools stating that schoolwide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic (56.4%) compared to behavior (41%) programs. This difference is affected both by differences in the percentage of schools who have a clearly defined core behavior versus academic program as well as the data systems to evaluate its effectiveness.

Some schools report that they have minimal behavior problems and do not cite implementation of a core behavior program

- *We have minimal behavior problems therefore there is no core behavior program implemented. Each teacher implements their own behavior plan with administrator support.*
- *Core data reflects that there are only 2 referrals for the current school year, but team is working on ways to improve analysis of behavior data*

Some cited this item as Achieved but did not describe a core behavior program.

- *We use the behavior data to meet the needs of our students struggling behaviorally*

Others described difficulty with the system they currently use to evaluate core behavior data.

- *We are working on this but since we do not have a formal behavioral data management system in progress we are somewhat handicapped due to rudimentary data base construction at this time. We have piloted a database for behavior which will be implemented*

Efforts during the upcoming year should focus upon helping schools to clearly define the systems used to evaluate core behavior data, Concerns regarding schools who have minimal behavioral difficulties should be addressed.

CURRICULUM-BASED MEASUREMENT (E.G., DIBELS) DATA ARE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER DATA SOURCES TO IDENTIFY STUDENTS NEEDING TARGETED GROUP INTERVENTIONS AND INDIVIDUALIZED INTERVENTIONS FOR ACADEMICS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 58 to 75 schools for a total of 63.5%.

Schools that rate this item as In Progress cite the need for assistance in matching assessments with interventions.

- *Data is collected and disaggregated on a regular basis. However, the connection between data and intervention design needs to be clearly aligned.*
- *Used within some classrooms more than others; not consistent. Reading Coach is developing the Curriculum Resource Map and linking assessment with intervention.*
- *We got better at this throughout the year and will begin the next school year looking at student data in order to organize kids for small group intervention.*

Those who rate this as Achieved express more confidence linking assessment with intervention components.

- *We have identified these students and placed them on teams for individualized interventions.*
- *Data from FAIR, curriculum based measures, etc. are used to target skill deficits and plan interventions for remediation.*
- *FAIR is used initially to identify students in need of progress monitoring. Additionally, some grade levels give every student in their grade level diagnostic assessment for additional information.*

OFFICE DISCIPLINARY REFERRAL DATA ARE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER DATA SOURCES TO IDENTIFY STUDENTS NEEDING TARGETED GROUP INTERVENTIONS AND INDIVIDUALIZED INTERVENTIONS FOR BEHAVIOR.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 33 to 51 schools for a total of 43.2%. Less than half of the schools in the district report this behavior item as having been Achieved. Schools cite difficulty linking data to behavioral interventions.

- *No documented processes in place to identify students or specific interventions*
- *Data is looked at but is not being used enough to identify students for targeted group or individualized interventions.*
- *Our SBLT team is working on improving our process to evaluate our data more frequently.*

Clarification and additional assistance is needed to provide schools with the means necessary to link data to intervention components of the PS/Rtl framework.

DATA ARE USED TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS (RTI) OF TIER 2 INTERVENTION PROGRAMS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 35 to 55 schools for a total of 47%. There are two components to this question- whether Tier 2 interventions are in place and whether inclusion in Tier 2 interventions are tied to data effectively. Comments suggest that this process is further along for academics than for behavior.

- *Especially in academics. Behavior is still in progress.*
- *For academics.*
- *Yes for academics. Needs to be systematic for behavior.*
- *Not started in behavior, started in academics such as reading.*
- *Strong for academics but needs to improvement for behavior.*

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT DATA ARE UTILIZED TO DETERMINE RESPONSE TO TIER 3 INTERVENTIONS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 68 to 94 schools for a total of 80.3%. The higher percentage of Achievement for this item is likely associated with the salience of students receiving Tier 3 interventions and the processes associated with these.

- *Weekly ongoing progress monitoring for academic and behavioral intervention is collected as well as weekly A-B-C analysis and frequency charts are used weekly for behavioral interventions.*
- *Individual student data are reviewed through each student's IEP and FBA reviews.*

| Table 5: Total number of Infrastructure Development: Data Usage items rated as Achieved or Maintaining | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|------|-------|
| | 0 | | 1 to 3 | | 4 to 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | Total |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Fall | 25 | 21.2% | 31 | 26.3% | 37 | 31% | 12 | 10.2% | 8 | 6.8% | 5 | 4.2% | 118 |
| Spring | 8 | 6.8% | 24 | 20.3% | 35 | 29.7% | 22 | 18.6% | 18 | 15.3% | 11 | 9.3% | 118 |

11 schools rated all 9 Data Usage items as Achieved/Maintained. 8 schools rated no items as Achieved/Maintained whereas 25 had done so in the Fall. Overall, these results suggest that improvement has occurred at the school level in the number of Data Usage components Achieved.

The six pilot schools all rated 7 or more Data Usage items as Achieved/Maintained, suggesting that effective data systems can be developed given sufficient time, resources, and support.

Several schools showed marked improvement in the degree to which Data Usage items were rated as Achieved/Maintained from the Fall to the Spring. For example, Dunedin Elementary increased from 0 to 8 items rated as Achieved/Maintained.

The overall mean number of Data Usage items rated as Achieved/Maintained increased from 3.64 items in the Fall to 5.62 items in the Spring.

| Table 6: Total Data Usage items Achieved by School | | |
|--|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Azalea Elementary | 8 | 9 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 2 | 9 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Belleair Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Blanton Elementary | 5 | 9 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 5 | 9 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 3 | 9 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 4 | 9 |
| San Jose Elementary | 5 | 9 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 8 | 9 |
| Anona Elementary | 6 | 8 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 7 | 8 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 1 | 8 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 1 | 8 |
| Lynch Elementary | 5 | 8 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 3 | 8 |
| New Heights Elementary | 7 | 8 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 6 | 8 |
| Osceola Middle | 7 | 8 |
| Ozona Elementary | 1 | 8 |
| Perkins Elementary | 7 | 8 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 7 | 8 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 2 | 8 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 4 | 8 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 9 | 8 |
| St. Petersburg High | 1 | 8 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 2 | 8 |
| Bauder Elementary | 7 | 7 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 7 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 1 | 7 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 1 | 7 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 4 | 7 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 7 | 7 |
| High Point Elementary | 6 | 7 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 7 | 7 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 8 | 7 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 7 | 7 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 3 | 7 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 8 | 7 |
| North Shore Elementary | 5 | 7 |
| Northwest Elementary | 9 | 7 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 4 | 7 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 5 | 7 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 1 | 7 |
| Seminole High | 6 | 7 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 6 | 7 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 6 | 7 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 6 | 7 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 3 | 7 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 4 | 6 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 5 | 6 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 3 | 6 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 1 | 6 |
| Frontier Elementary | 5 | 6 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 1 | 6 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 0 | 6 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 6 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 2 | 6 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 2 | 6 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 3 | 6 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 8 | 6 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 1 | 6 |
| Starkey Elementary | 3 | 6 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 4 | 6 |
| Westgate Elementary | 4 | 6 |
| Belcher Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 5 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 0 | 5 |
| Maximo Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Melrose Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Plumb Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Tyrone Middle | 4 | 5 |
| Countryside High | 2 | 4 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 5 | 4 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Gibbs High | 5 | 4 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 4 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 4 | 4 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 1 | 4 |
| Skyview Elementary | 7 | 4 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 8 | 4 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Bayside High | 6 | 3 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 3 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 5 | 3 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 2 | 3 |
| Largo High | 0 | 3 |
| Nina Harris | 0 | 3 |
| Osceola High | 7 | 3 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Seminole Middle | 2 | 3 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 2 |
| Hamilton Disston | 2 | 2 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 2 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 2 |
| Seminole Elementary | 7 | 2 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 8 | 2 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 0 | 2 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 8 | 1 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 4 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 0 | 1 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 5 | 1 |
| Azalea Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Bay Point Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 1 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 4 | 0 |

| | | |
|------------|------|------|
| Total Mean | 3.64 | 5.32 |
|------------|------|------|

DATA USAGE SUMMARY

The effective use of data to drive instruction and intervention is comprised of three elements. Schools must have data systems in place, they must have intervention systems in place, and they must connect the two such that data informs intervention decisions. Results indicate that implementation levels vary widely across the district. Pilot schools report 7 or more item as Achieved and several schools increased the number of items Achieved substantially from the Fall to the Spring. These results indicate that effective data usage can occur given time and practice to develop and implement these systems.

A foundation for success with regard to data usage is the collection of schoolwide data through an efficient and effective systematic process. This was reported as being Achieved at 89 schools. This component should be Achieved by 100% of schools by the conclusion of the 2011-2012 school year. It is a foundation upon which the PS/Rtl framework is built. District leadership can identify schools who did not rate this component as Achieved and work with them to assure that is Achieved this school year.

Although 86 schools stated that they used statewide and other databases to make data-based decisions, comments were often not clear concerning the process through which this is done. This year, we can make sure that data systems are in place at all schools. However, achievement of this component represents the end result of a system in which data and intervention components and the connection between the two are clear and integrated systematically.

64 Schools stated that school-wide data are presented to staff after each benchmarking session. Schools rating this component as Achieved cited a system where data is shared routinely at faculty meetings and PLCs. This is a foundation component where once each school has identified their systematic data collection system they can articulate a process whereby data is shared at faculty and PLC meetings. This can be included in the SIP and achieved close to 100% this year.

The percentage of schools who state that schoolwide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs is lower than those who report doing so for academic programs. Comments suggested that not all schools have a clearly defined core behavior program. Some schools cite a lack of behavioral difficulties as a barrier to construction of a core behavior program. Guidelines exist for all schools to be able to construct a core behavior program. Achievement of a clearly defined core behavior program is an attainable goal for all schools for the coming year. Similarly, construction of a systematic data system to evaluate the effectiveness of the core behavior program is attainable in the coming year.

Results suggest that development and implementation of Tier 2 of the PS/Rtl framework, particularly for behavior, is a challenge for schools. Training must focus particular attention on the process of selecting students for Tier 2 interventions, for determining which Tier 2 interventions to use particularly for behavior, and then to evaluate the effectiveness of these through data analysis. This is an area that likely requires intensive support and may take more than one year to accomplish effectively across schools.

94 schools state that individual student data are utilized to determine response to Tier 3 interventions. This number is likely elevated due to the salience of students receiving Tier 3 interventions and the processes associated with these. All schools should be able to do this effectively.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT: SPECIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILITY

| Table 7: Infrastructure Development: Special Education Eligibility | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Special Education Eligibility determination is made using the Rtl model for Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (EBD). | Fall | 22 | 19.3% | 31 | 27.2% | 47 | 41.2% | 14 | 12.3% | 114 |
| | Spring | 12 | 10.8% | 31 | 27.9% | 31 | 27.9% | 37 | 33.3% | 111 |
| Special Education Eligibility determination is made using the Rtl model for Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD). | Fall | 20 | 17.2% | 43 | 37.1% | 42 | 36.2% | 11 | 9.5% | 116 |
| | Spring | 9 | 7.9% | 26 | 22.8% | 43 | 37.7% | 36 | 31.6% | 114 |

SPECIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION IS MADE USING THE RTI MODEL FOR EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISABILITIES (EBD).

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 61 to 68 schools for a total of 61.2%. Comments indicated that schools are following the law by complying with this item. Many of the comments stated that for schools In Progress or Not Started they were aware of the process but had not made an eligibility determination for any student as of yet.

- *N/A at this time. Most students eligible for EBD services are placed prior to high school. Team is in place to utilize the RTI model for EBD identification.*
- *We have not placed a student in EBD through the RTI model, but we are aware that is the path that needs to be taken.*
- *Not applicable - Have not had this situation at our school.*
- *ESE eligibility determination made but not for EBD. If needed, it will be done.*
- *No Tier 3 behavior interventions have led to requests for eligibility decisions. Tier 3 interventions have been consistent and have been reviewed and modified effectively with fidelity and integrity.*
- *No Tier 3 student has gone through the entire process for Rtl EBD this school year 2010-2011.*
- *We have not had a student move through entire process for beh. to elig. under Rtl*

SPECIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION IS MADE USING THE RTI MODEL FOR SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES (SLD).

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 53 to 79 schools for a total of 69.3%. Comments mirrored those for EBD by stating that compliance is the law and that some schools have not had a student qualify for an eligibility determination. Comments for some schools stated that this was a new process for them this year, which may explain the increase in Achieved/Maintaining ratings relative to those for EBD.

- *We piloted the no discrepancy model last school year and are continuing to implement with the change in the SLD rule as of July 1*
- *Yes, students have been determined eligible for academic exceptionalities through the RTI model this year.*

| Table 8: Total number of Infrastructure Development: Special Education Eligibility items rated as Achieved or Maintaining | | | | | | | |
|---|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-------|
| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | Total |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Fall | 55 | 46.6% | 12 | 10.2% | 51 | 43.2% | 118 |
| Spring | 34 | 28.8% | 21 | 17.8% | 63 | 53.4% | 118 |

While only 53.4% of schools rated both items as having been Achieved, those who did not may have done so due to not having students for whom a Special Education Eligibility determination was made. All of the pilot schools rated both of these items as having been Achieved.

| Table 9: Total Special Education Eligibility items Achieved by School | | |
|---|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Anona Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Bauder Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Belcher Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Belleair Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Blanton Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 2 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 2 | 2 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Frontier Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Gibbs High | 0 | 2 |
| High Point Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 1 | 2 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Lynch Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Maximo Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Melrose Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| New Heights Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| North Shore Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Northwest Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Osceola High | 2 | 2 |
| Osceola Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Perkins Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Plumb Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 2 | 2 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| San Jose Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Seminole Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Seminole High | 2 | 2 |
| Seminole Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| St. Petersburg High | 0 | 2 |
| Starkey Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Westgate Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Azalea Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 0 | 1 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 1 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Hamilton Disston | 0 | 1 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Ozona Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 0 | 1 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Skyview Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Azalea Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Bay Point Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Bayside High | 2 | 0 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 0 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 1 | 0 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 0 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 1 | 0 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 2 | 0 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 2 | 0 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 2 | 0 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Nina Harris | 0 | 0 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 0 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 0 | 0 |

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Pinellas Park Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 0 | 0 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 2 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 2 | 0 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Tyrone Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0.97 | 1.25 |

SPECIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILITY SUMMARY

Compliance with these items is the law. Schools who do not endorse these items stated that they did not have a student who qualified during the school year for an eligibility determination. A separate evaluation would need to be done to determine whether every school is complying with the law. These items are not suitable for this purpose.

| Table 10: Infrastructure Development: Selection of Evidence-Based Practices | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices: Tier 1 | Fall | 8 | 6.8% | 53 | 45.3% | 45 | 38.5% | 11 | 9.4% | 117 |
| | Spring | 8 | 6.8% | 34 | 29.1% | 40 | 34.2% | 35 | 29.9% | 117 |
| The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices: Tier 2 | Fall | 13 | 11.1% | 65 | 55.6% | 36 | 30.8% | 3 | 2.6% | 117 |
| | Spring | 7 | 5.9% | 45 | 38.1% | 43 | 36.4% | 23 | 19.5% | 118 |
| The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices: Tier 3 | Fall | 13 | 11.0% | 66 | 55.9% | 37 | 31.4% | 2 | 1.7% | 118 |
| | Spring | 11 | 9.3% | 26 | 22.0% | 54 | 45.8% | 27 | 22.9% | 118 |

THE SCHOOL STAFF HAS A PROCESS TO SELECT EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES: TIER 1

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 56 to 75 schools for a total of 64.1%. Comments from school Achieving this component cited a resource map developed at the district level. Most comments cited academic core curriculum with fewer references to behavior.

- *we follow district guidelines for core curriculum*
- *District core curriculum is effective at our school.*
- *We have a detailed school resource map covering all areas.*
- *Resource map indicating research-based instructional materials for academics and behavior is available.*
- *The training we received at the district level this year really helped us see the importance of this. It was very helpful when discussing Tier 1 changes for next year.*
- *There is a process for selecting evidence-based practices. Follow through in some cases is not so evident.*

Schools In Progress on this component also reference resource maps and district support. They may less confident in their implementation relative to those rating this component as Achieved.

- *Reading Coach is in the process of developing a curriculum resource map to align resources with intervention for reading. Core - evidenced based - affective curriculum needs to be more consistent across school. Utilization of Resource Protocol Map, Brainstorming best practices with grade level peers and SBLT team input provided.*

Responses from other schools suggested that they were less advanced in the process of selecting evidenced-based practices.

- *Teacher judgment.*
- *We do not have a process in place to select these interventions.*
- *school has plan for next year*

THE SCHOOL STAFF HAS A PROCESS TO SELECT EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES: TIER 2

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 39 to 66 schools for a total of 55.9%. Comments mirrored those for Tier 1 indicating the use or resource maps. Schools rating themselves In Progress cite partial implementation of evidenced-based practices.

- *Academics: Maintained in the area of reading; however, not in the areas of math, science, or writing*
- *Resources map for reading and mathematics was created. There is a process to review FAIR, ODR, and Attendance data to develop interventions. Could expand resource maps to include behavior/attendance.*
- *We do not for math.*

Others cite difficulty identifying a process.

- *Working on a plan.*
- *very few intervention programs available are evidence-based*
- *Teachers are aware, not a systematic process.*

THE SCHOOL STAFF HAS A PROCESS TO SELECT EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES: TIER 3

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 39 to 81 schools for a total of 68.7%. Schools cite use of the resource map as well as district level involvement and support.

- *SBLT team utilizes research and district level trainings to determine effective evidence-based practices. As a center-based school, all students have an IEP and progress is monitored every 6 weeks to identify needs and implement plans.*
- *Child Study Team members choose interventions based on existing bank of evidenced-based practices and programs (eg Champs/Foundations, DFS state website, CASEL, etc.)*
- *Heavy involvement from RTI coordinator.*
- *The team has suggested evidence-based interventions that align with the area of need and align with the resources and supports available at the school.*
- *Yes, with the support and guidance of student services staff.*

Those rating this component as In Progress cite a less systemized process for selecting evidence-based interventions.

- *not a formal process; individual interventionists determine based on data*
- *Developed on an individual basis as needed, No documented processes in place.*
- *Team feels school and/or district currently lacks sufficient resources and time to address all other academic areas.*
- *FBA - evidence based only for Tier 3; academic evidence based for some areas and some grades, but not yet for all areas and all grades*

| Table 11: Total number of Infrastructure Development: Selection of Evidence-Based Practices items rated as Achieved or Maintaining | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-------|----|-------|---|------|----|-------|-------|
| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | Total |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Fall | 54 | 45.8% | 25 | 21.2% | 8 | 6.8% | 31 | 26.3% | 118 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-----|
| Spring | 23 | 19.5% | 23 | 19.5% | 17 | 14.4% | 55 | 46.6% | 118 |
|--------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-----|

Results indicate that 55 schools (46.6%) rated each of the three items as Achieved/Maintained. This represents a clear improvement from the Fall of 2010 where 31 schools (26.3%) had done so.

Results below specify the number of Evidence-Based Practices items rated as Achieved/Maintained by school. All pilot schools rated each of these items as Achieved/Maintained. Bay Point Middle, Melrose Elementary, Mildred Helms Elementary, and Sunset Hills Elementary had rated all three items as Achieved in the Fall but did not do so in the Spring. These items are open to interpretation and can have a degree of unreliability due to interpretations. Nevertheless, each school who does not rate any of these items as Achieved should be contacted and provided the information and support necessary to select evidence-based practices. This is a core activity that must reach 100% Achievement as soon as possible and definitely by the end of 2011-2012.

| Table 12: Total Selection of Evidenced-Based Practices items Achieved by School | | |
|---|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Anona Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Azalea Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Bauder Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Belleair Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Blanton Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 0 | 3 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Frontier Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| High Point Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 3 | 3 |
| Lynch Elementary | 3 | 3 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| New Heights Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| North Shore Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Northwest Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Ozona Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 0 | 3 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Plumb Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 3 | 3 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| San Jose Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Seminole High | 1 | 3 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Skyview Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Starkey Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 2 | 3 |
| Westgate Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 0 | 2 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 1 | 2 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Osceola Middle | 2 | 2 |
| Perkins Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Seminole Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Seminole Middle | 1 | 2 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| St. Petersburg High | 0 | 2 |
| Tyrone Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Belcher Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 1 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 1 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 1 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Gibbs High | 0 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 0 | 1 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Largo High | 0 | 1 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Maximo Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Nina Harris | 0 | 1 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 1 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 3 | 1 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 1 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 0 | 1 |
| Azalea Middle | 1 | 0 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Bay Point Middle | 3 | 0 |
| Bayside High | 0 | 0 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 0 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 0 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Hamilton Disston | 0 | 0 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Melrose Elementary | 3 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 3 | 0 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Osceola High | 0 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 0 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 1 | 0 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 3 | 0 |
| Total | 1.14 | 1.88 |

SELECTION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES SUMMARY

Review of comments indicated that a resource map is available to schools to select evidenced-based interventions. Comments suggested that many schools were confident in their ability to select evidenced-based interventions using the resources available. The goal for the coming year is to utilize these resources to help schools In Progress to select evidence-based practices. Many schools are aware of the process for doing so yet are not fully assured of their ability to do so. Others may be unaware of the process for selecting evidence-based interventions and require clarification concerning this process. As these questions did not specify Academic versus Behavior evidenced-based practices, those working with schools who rate these items as Achieved must assure that the process of selecting evidence-based practices is in fact Achieved for both Academic and Behavior practices. This is a core activity that must reach 100% Achievement as soon as possible and definitely by the end of 2011-2012.

| Table 13: Infrastructure Development: School-Based Leadership Team activity | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| The School-Based Leadership Team has a regular meeting schedule for problem-solving activities. | Fall | 4 | 3.4% | 21 | 17.8% | 75 | 63.6% | 18 | 15.3% | 118 |
| | Spring | 3 | 2.5% | 26 | 22.0% | 35 | 29.7% | 54 | 45.8% | 118 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team evaluates target student's/students' Rtl at regular meetings. | Fall | 14 | 11.9% | 46 | 39.0% | 45 | 38.1% | 13 | 11.0% | 118 |
| | Spring | 8 | 6.8% | 39 | 33.3% | 36 | 30.8% | 34 | 29.1% | 117 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team involves parents. | Fall | 53 | 44.9% | 36 | 30.5% | 23 | 19.5% | 6 | 5.1% | 118 |
| | Spring | 44 | 37.6% | 36 | 30.8% | 24 | 20.5% | 13 | 11.1% | 117 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team has regularly scheduled data day meetings to evaluate Tier 1 and Tier 2 data. | Fall | 29 | 24.8% | 56 | 47.9% | 24 | 20.5% | 8 | 6.8% | 117 |
| | Spring | 19 | 16.1% | 51 | 43.2% | 28 | 23.7% | 20 | 16.9% | 118 |

THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM HAS A REGULAR MEETING SCHEDULE FOR PROBLEM-SOLVING ACTIVITIES.

The number of schools Achieving this item decreased from 93 to 89 for a total of 74.5%. Those rating this component as In Progress commented that their focus on problem solving activities needed improvement.

- *Although SBLT meets regularly, the Rtl problem-solving process is not used on a routine basis.*
- *Data not always up to date.*
- *Meetings are scheduled and documented on our school calendar; however, problem solving activities do not always occur- time constraints, teacher availability can hinder process*
- *We had regular meetings and they were scheduled in advance, we can improve on our use of problem-solving.*

A separate item that did not reference problem solving would have been helpful. We do need to assure that all schools have a SBLT with a regular meeting schedule. The three schools who rated this component as Not Started (Lakewood High, Meadowlawn Middle, Tarpon Springs High) rated very few items as Achieved across the SAPSI. These three schools in particular should have a SBLT meeting regularly to improve their implementation of the PS/Rtl framework.

THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM EVALUATES TARGET STUDENT'S/STUDENTS' RTI AT REGULAR MEETINGS

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 58 to 70 for a total of 59.9%. Comments from schools Achieving this item indicated a systematic process for reviewing target students' Rtl.

- *The School-Based Leadership Team meets weekly to determine the process and evaluate the process for the students on tier 2 and 3.*
- *Response to intervention of students in targeted skill groups are reviewed after 4 data collection points.*
- *Tier 2 data is evaluated every 5 weeks. Tier 3 individual student data is evaluated every 6-8 weeks. Core data is discussed at weekly SBLT meetings/ monthly PBS meetings.*

Those that rated this component as In Progress noted separate processes or foci for SBLTs.

- *If our team is looking at individual students, then usually we have a sub group that meets at a separate time from the SBLT team to evaluate what's working.*
- *It occurs regularly in child study team.*
- *Target more behavioral issues at SBLT but do discuss and target some academics*

Others noted that the process for evaluating target students' Rtl is less well developed.

- *Need to improve processes - we are not quick enough at reviewing data and meeting consistently (i.e., data reviews).*
- *No documented processes in place*
- *We have started this process but are still working to evaluate how it is done.*
- *Our SBLT team is working on improving our process to evaluate our data more frequently.*

A question asking whether a process is in place to evaluate target students' Rtl at regular meetings (regardless of whether these are SBLT, CST, etc) would have been more helpful. The percent of schools achieving this item would be higher than 59.9%. A follow-up with all schools who did not rate this item as Achieved would be necessary to determine if a process is in place to regularly evaluate individual students' Rtl.

THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM INVOLVES PARENTS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 29 to 37 for a total of 31.6%. Confidentiality and assistance concerning addressing this factor was again raised as a barrier to parent participation.

- *We would like direction on how to best involve parents (that aren't also staff members)- especially when, sometimes, confidential information would come up at our meetings.*
- *We have not yet figured out how to involve parents in this process.*
- *Parents are not involved in SBLT team meetings due to confidentiality, but are involved in Tier 3 meetings.*
- *We do not involve parents in our meetings, although they are involved in the follow up - meeting w/ guidance, case managers, social worker, psychologist, etc...*

Those who rate this item as Achieved cite involvement of SAC and PTA

- *Through relaying information on the School Improvement Plan regarding PS/Rtl to SAC, parents are made aware of PS/Rtl.*
- *Parents are involved through PTA and SAC*

Parent involvement is also cited through newsletters and other groups involving parents.

- *Community Connect, Hispanic Outreach, Partnership with Clearwater Hispanic Outreach, Girlfriends, 5000 Role Models*
- *Workshops, flyers, PCTA /SAC involvement, Title 1 surveys*
- *Newsletter/PTA*

The percentage of schools rating this component as Achieved/Maintained is low. Providing guidance to all schools concerning confidentiality issues and sharing means through which the SBLT communicates with SAC/PTA and other parent-involved groups can increase achievement of this component in the coming year.

THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM HAS REGULARLY SCHEDULED DATA DAY MEETINGS TO EVALUATE TIER 1 AND TIER 2 DATA.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 32 to 48 for a total of 40.6%. Comments suggest that schools require increased attention to scheduling data day meetings regularly.

- *Have met but not a consistent schedule and not frequent enough.*
- *more structured plan/calendar in place for next year*
- *We discuss Tier 1 and Tier 2 data periodically, but it is not regularly scheduled.*
- *Although cohort meetings discuss data this is not a regularly scheduled activity.*
- *We are planning to do that next year :)*

Some schools do have a set process and can serve as a template for others.

- *Tier 1 data is reviewed after each assessment cycle. Tier 2 data is reviewed after 4 data collection points.*
- *This is an ongoing part of our team. We have set data review days already for next year.*
- *We meet after all assessment cycles, as well as on a monthly basis.*
- *Tier 1 is discussed at weekly PLCs and after every testing cycle. Tier 2 data is discussed every 5 weeks at grade level data chats.*

The comments do not provide an impression that “Data Day Meetings” have become a recognized way of work districtwide. Doing so can be helpful as schools scale up their processes for using data. The 40.6% Achievement level also indicates plenty of room for growth in this component in the coming year.

| Table 14: Total number of Infrastructure Development: School-Based Leadership Team activity items rated as Achieved or Maintaining | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-------|
| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | Total |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Fall | 24 | 20.3% | 29 | 24.6% | 25 | 21.2% | 27 | 22.9% | 13 | 11.0% | 118 |
| Spring | 17 | 14.4% | 24 | 20.3% | 31 | 26.3% | 26 | 22.0% | 20 | 16.9% | 118 |

Results indicate that 20 schools report Achievement of all 4 SBLT Infrastructure components. The number of schools who report Achievement of none of the 4 components declined from 24 to 17. Overall, the difference in SBLT Infrastructure ratings from the Fall to the Spring was modest.

The mean number of SBLT Infrastructure items increased modestly from 1.80 to 2.07. Only 3 of the 6 pilot schools Achieved all 4 components. 3 of the 6 rated parent participation as In Progress. New Heights Elementary also rated the first item as In Progress and stated that scheduling of regular data day meetings had Not Started. Less than full Achievement of these components by pilot schools highlights the need for increased attention to them.

| Table 15: Total SBLT Infrastructure Development items Achieved by School | | |
|--|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Bauder Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Frontier Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| North Shore Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Northwest Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Ozona Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 3 | 4 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Starkey Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 3 | 4 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Anona Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Bayside High | 2 | 3 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Belleair Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Blanton Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 4 | 3 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 3 | 3 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Osceola High | 2 | 3 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Plumb Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| San Jose Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Seminole High | 3 | 3 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Seminole Middle | 1 | 3 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| St. Petersburg High | 4 | 3 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 3 | 3 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Westgate Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Belcher Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 2 | 2 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Hamilton Disston | 0 | 2 |
| High Point Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 3 | 2 |
| Lynch Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Maximo Elementary | 4 | 2 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Melrose Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Osceola Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 1 | 2 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Perkins Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Skyview Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 4 | 2 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 2 | 2 |
| Azalea Elementary | 4 | 1 |
| Azalea Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Bay Point Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Boca Ciega High | 1 | 1 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 2 | 1 |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Clearwater High | 0 | 1 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Dunedin High | 1 | 1 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Gibbs High | 2 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 1 | 1 |
| Largo High | 0 | 1 |
| New Heights Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Nina Harris | 1 | 1 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 1 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 2 | 1 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 0 | 1 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Seminole Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Tyrone Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 1 | 0 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 4 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 0 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 0 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 1.80 | 2.07 |

SBLT INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

Every school should have a SBLT that meets regularly, preferably weekly. The strength of their problem solving will improve with practice. Implementation of Data Day Meetings at all schools is a process that can be implemented and

measured with clarity. Doing so will help focus attention on data analysis at each school. Implementation of Data Day Meetings should be included on all SIPs and can be achieved at a 70% level or higher by the end of 2011-2012.

All schools should have a clearly defined process whereby parents are included in the problem solving process. Confidentiality issues must be addressed. Communication with PTA and SAC groups can be specified in SIPs. This can be included in SIPs and achieved at a 70% level or higher by year end.

IMPLEMENTATION: THREE-TIERED SYSTEM OF SERVICE DELIVERY

| Table 16: Implementation: Three-Tiered System of Service Delivery | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Tier 1 Academic Core Instruction clearly identified | Fall | 5 | 4.2% | 31 | 26.3% | 67 | 56.8% | 15 | 12.7% | 118 |
| | Spring | 2 | 1.7% | 23 | 19.5% | 38 | 32.2% | 55 | 46.6% | 118 |
| Tier 1 Behavioral Core Instruction clearly identified | Fall | 8 | 6.8% | 49 | 41.5% | 51 | 43.2% | 10 | 8.5% | 118 |
| | Spring | 3 | 2.5% | 36 | 30.5% | 38 | 32.2% | 41 | 34.7% | 118 |
| Tier 2 Academic Supplemental Instruction/Program clearly identified | Fall | 9 | 7.7% | 55 | 47.0% | 44 | 37.6% | 9 | 7.7% | 117 |
| | Spring | 2 | 1.7% | 38 | 32.5% | 45 | 38.5% | 32 | 27.4% | 117 |
| Tier 2 Behavioral Supplemental Instruction/Program clearly identified | Fall | 15 | 12.7% | 73 | 61.9% | 27 | 22.9% | 3 | 2.5% | 118 |
| | Spring | 10 | 8.6% | 67 | 57.8% | 22 | 19.0% | 17 | 14.7% | 116 |
| Tier 3 Academic Intensive Strategies/Program are evidence-based | Fall | 12 | 10.2% | 50 | 42.4% | 49 | 41.5% | 7 | 5.9% | 118 |
| | Spring | 12 | 10.2% | 22 | 18.6% | 45 | 38.1% | 39 | 33.1% | 118 |
| Tier 3 Behavioral Intensive Strategies/Program are evidence-based | Fall | 14 | 11.9% | 54 | 45.8% | 43 | 36.4% | 7 | 5.9% | 118 |
| | Spring | 12 | 10.3% | 30 | 25.9% | 44 | 37.9% | 30 | 25.9% | 116 |

TIER 1 ACADEMIC CORE INSTRUCTION CLEARLY IDENTIFIED

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 82 to 93 for a total of 68.8%. The comments by those schools rating this component as Achieved/Maintained noted that the Academic Core is mandated by law and prescribed by district policy. Only four schools who rated this item as In Progress or Not Started provided comments (below) which did not provide insights concerning what may be done to improve Achievement of this component.

- *Tier 1 academic core instruction is clearly identified in curriculum and benchmark expectations. Staff members acknowledge and understand the three-tier system of intervention. Due to the nature of this program very few students are considered Tier 1.*
- *We are working with the district to establish our Tier 1 Core Instruction.*
- *We have our goals in place; this was year one of a 5 year process.*
- *(Not Started) Core academic instruction is prescribed by the district.*

Follow-up is necessary to determine what is needed for all schools to Achieve this component.

TIER 1 BEHAVIORAL CORE INSTRUCTION CLEARLY IDENTIFIED

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 61 to 79 for a total of 66.9%. Those rating this component as Achieved were able to cite specific components of their Behavioral Core.

- *As evidenced by Bardmoor's BEST PBS system*
- *CHAMPS, School-wide Foundations, Class-wide behavior plan for each classroom*
- *PBS school-wide program, Defend a Friend Bully Prevention program. Information is shared on the morning show, Defend a Friend pledge is recited, Defend a Friend shirts are worn on Wednesday and the majority of students and teachers/staff wear their shirts*
- *PBS, Hawk ticket system*
- *Fundamental policy causes us to have many policies and procedures for schoolwide issues related to behavior already in place.*
- *Positive Paws Character Education Bullying Prevention*

Those not Achieving this component may need to devote more time to implementation of a Behavioral Core in the coming year.

- *Discipline Plan developed but need to improve implementation. Need to reach consensus among staff on expectations for core behavior instruction.*
- *No documented processes in place*
- *We have the student code of conduct.*
- *it's been communicated at the beginning of the school and followed up on by school administration, but is not posted in classroom.*

Examples can be provided by schools who have Achieved this component. The process for selecting Behavioral Core components is available from the district. Each school must do so and be able to implement this component in the coming year.

TIER 2 ACADEMIC SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION/PROGRAM CLEARLY IDENTIFIED

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 53 to 77 for a total of 65.9%. Those rating this component as Achieved referenced the Resource Map as a guide. Comments suggested that supplemental instruction in Reading may be more advanced than for Math.

- *Reading Resource Map developed. Would like to know about Math resources and have sought out support, but have not received any information in return.*
- *In the area of Reading only, at this time.*
- *Reading Leadership Team meets monthly to address these issues.*
- *More needed in area of math*
- *We still need more for math.*
- *Better for Reading than other areas*
- *Only through reading and a little bit in math*
- *in Reading; there's a need for Math*

There are 40 schools who did not rate this component as Achieved. Further support for Math may improve achievement of this component. All schools should be able to Achieve this component by the conclusion of 2011-2012.

TIER 2 BEHAVIORAL SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION/PROGRAM CLEARLY IDENTIFIED

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 30 to 39 for a total of 33.7%. While the existence of the Resource Map is noted, these data suggest that Tier 2 Behavioral instruction is not well implemented districtwide.

- *Continuing to research behavioral interventions at the Tier 2 level of intensity.*
- *processes being put in place*
- *Programs available and training is provided to teachers when needed. However, a list of interventions is not established as thoroughly as the list available for academics.*
- *Teachers bring up areas of concern and informally suggest small group interventions*
- *We do have one identified resource but are needing one more.*
- *We have a behavior resource map, but would like to refine it as well as research the effectiveness of the interventions.*
- *Tier 2 behavior interventions need to be more clearly established.*

Implementation of Tier 2 Behavioral Instruction is a process that does not appear to be well implemented districtwide. As this is part of the core of the three-tiered PS/RtI framework, significant attention and resources should be devoted to assisting schools in the implementation of this tier in the coming year. Achievement of this component should be higher than 33.7% and is a notable area of need. A Resource Map and options are available to continue to address this need.

TIER 3 ACADEMIC INTENSIVE STRATEGIES/PROGRAM ARE EVIDENCE-BASED

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 56 to 84 for a total of 71.2%. Comments provided by those who rate this component as Achieved are not clear concerning whether evidence-based practices are used.

- *Lesson plans, PSWs Again, very few programs available are evidence-based*
- *Reading Coach supports development of individualized interventions for targeted students.*
- *Smaller intervention groups organized and appropriate intervention implemented. Weekly monitoring of academic progress, graphed , and reviewed.*
- *Students were targeted to receive tutoring through Title 1 support before, during and after school.*

34 schools did not rate this component as Achieved. Comments were received from 7 of these. Whether evidence-based practices are used or plan to be used are unclear from these comments.

- *After school tutoring available based on individual student needs*
- *Co-taught classes, Linda-mood Bell reading curriculum.*
- *Need more for math*
- *Our reading 3 tier system is strong!*
- *Reading Coach is developing a list of what is being implemented within each classroom and across grade levels. Every student has an IEP that contains academic/instructional goals; few actual Tier 3 PSWs for academic remediation are being developed*
- *WE could improve on fidelity of implementation and communication across team members regarding changes to interventions if a child is showing questionable or poor RtI.*
- *We have IEP's and 504's.*

TIER 3 BEHAVIORAL INTENSIVE STRATEGIES/PROGRAM ARE EVIDENCE-BASED

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 50 to 74 for a total of 63.8%. While comments suggested that a process was in place to provide supports at Tier 3, they again didn't provide a clear indication concerning whether strategies used at Tier 3 were evidence-based.

- *Tier 3 behavioral interventionists (Student Services staff) routinely utilized*
- *All students have an active FBA/PBIP that is reviewed at least annually; when needed, highly specialized PBIPs are written for the high needs students.*
- *Psychologist supports and directs FBA and PSW and our Rtl Behavior Coach and ESE teacher provides additional support and ideas for behavior interventions along with the identified Rtl team.*

Comments from schools In Progress suggested a need for direction concerning evidence-based practices for behavior.

- *Would like to do more research on behavior interventions.*
- *processes being put in place*
- *Working on a plan.*

Overall, the lack of clarity concerning reasons why schools did or did not rate this item as Achieved suggests that further clarification is necessary concerning implementation of evidence-based tier 3 behavior practices.

| Table 17: Total number of Implementation: Three-Tiered System of Service Delivery items rated as Achieved or Maintaining | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-------|
| | | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Academic | Fall | 28 | 23.7% | 31 | 26.3% | 17 | 14.4% | 42 | 35.6% | 118 |
| | Spring | 14 | 11.9% | 17 | 14.4% | 24 | 20.3% | 63 | 53.4% | 118 |
| Behavior | Fall | 43 | 36.4% | 35 | 29.7% | 14 | 11.9% | 26 | 22.0% | 118 |
| | Spring | 21 | 17.8% | 34 | 28.8% | 31 | 26.3% | 32 | 27.1% | 118 |

Results indicate that 63 schools rate the components of all three tiers as being Achieved for Academics and 32 schools rate the components of all three tiers as being Achieved for Behavior.

While all 6 pilot schools rated each Academic tier as having been Achieved, only 2 did so for Behavior. Forest Lakes stated that Tier 1 was In Progress, but did not provide a comment. Bauder, Belleair, Forest Lakes, and Woodlawn Elementary all stated that Tier 2 was In Progress. Two comments stated:

- *Continuing to research behavioral interventions at the Tier 2 level of intensity.*
- *Developed TIER 2 system and standard protocol map- in progress since November of 2010*

One pilot school did not provide a rating concerning Tier 3 for Behavior and stated:

- See FBA's

This pattern of responses for the pilot schools supports the impression that Tier 2 for behavior is not as well developed as necessary and whether interventions at level 3 are evidenced-based is not clear.

| Table 18: Total Academic Three-Tiered System of Service Delivery items by School | | |
|--|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Anona Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Azalea Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Bauder Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Belcher Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Belleair Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Blanton Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 3 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 1 | 3 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 3 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Frontier Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Lynch Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 2 | 3 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Melrose Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| New Heights Elementary | 3 | 3 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| North Shore Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Northwest Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Ozona Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 3 | 3 |
| Perkins Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Plumb Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 3 | 3 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 3 | 3 |
| San Jose Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Seminole High | 2 | 3 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 1 | 3 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Tyrone Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Bayside High | 1 | 2 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 2 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 2 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| High Point Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 0 | 2 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Osceola Middle | 1 | 2 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Palm Harbor Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 2 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Skyview Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| St. Petersburg High | 1 | 2 |
| Starkey Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 1 | 2 |
| Westgate Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Azalea Middle | 2 | 1 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Hamilton Disston | 0 | 1 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Largo High | 0 | 1 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 3 | 1 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 3 | 1 |
| Nina Harris | 1 | 1 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 1 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Seminole Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Seminole Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 0 | 1 |
| Bay Point Middle | 3 | 0 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 1 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Gibbs High | 1 | 0 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 3 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Maximo Elementary | 2 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 3 | 0 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 0 |
| Osceola High | 3 | 0 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 3 | 0 |
| Total | 1.62 | 2.15 |

Table 19: Total Behavioral Three-Tiered System of Service Delivery items Achieved by School

| | Fall | Spring |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|
| Anona Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Azalea Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Blanton Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 2 | 3 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 3 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 0 | 3 |
| New Heights Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Northwest Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Ozona Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 3 | 3 |
| Perkins Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 3 | 3 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 3 | 3 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 3 | 3 |
| San Jose Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Seminole High | 1 | 3 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 1 | 3 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Westgate Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Bauder Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Belcher Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 0 | 2 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Frontier Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Hamilton Disston | 2 | 2 |
| High Point Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Lynch Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Maximo Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Melrose Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| North Shore Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Osceola Middle | 1 | 2 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 2 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Seminole Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| St. Petersburg High | 2 | 2 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Tyrone Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 3 | 2 |
| Bayside High | 1 | 1 |
| Belleair Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 1 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 1 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 1 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 1 | 1 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 3 | 1 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Largo High | 0 | 1 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 1 | 1 |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 1 | 1 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 3 | 1 |
| Nina Harris | 0 | 1 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park High | 0 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 2 | 1 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Seminole Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Starkey Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 0 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Azalea Middle | 1 | 0 |
| Bay Point Middle | 3 | 0 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Gibbs High | 1 | 0 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 0 | 0 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 1 | 0 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 3 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 0 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Osceola High | 3 | 0 |
| Plumb Elementary | 2 | 0 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Skyview Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 1.19 | 1.63 |

THREE-TIERED SYSTEM OF SERVICE DELIVERY SUMMARY

At Tier 1, follow-up is necessary to determine steps necessary for all schools to rate implementation of the Academic Core as Achieved. There is likely variability in the degree to which a Behavioral Core is implemented across schools. Guidelines exist, and practices from effective schools can be replicated as a Behavioral Core is implemented districtwide. All schools should rate Academic and Behavioral core components as Achieved by year end.

Improved implementation of supplemental Math Instruction should improve the degree to which Tier 2 Academic instruction is Achieved districtwide. Supplemental Behavioral Instruction was rated as Achieved by only 33.7% of schools and is a central focus for improvement in implementation. Results from all schools, including pilot schools suggest that implementation of Tier 2 for Behavior is a process that requires additional support and guidance.

Results were not clear in terms of the degree to which evidence-based practices were used to guide instruction at Tier 3. Efforts should focus upon clarification of evidence-based practices and their implementation at Tier 3 in the coming year. 100% of schools should be able to select and implement evidenced-based practices across all three tiers for Academics and Behavior in the coming year.

IMPLEMENTATION: EFFECTIVE PROBLEM SOLVING PROCEDURES

| Table 20: Implementation: Effective Problem Solving Procedures | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Problem is defined as a data-based discrepancy (GAP Analysis) between what is expected and what is occurring (includes peer and benchmark data). | Fall | 20 | 17.4% | 63 | 54.8% | 26 | 22.6% | 6 | 5.2% | 115 |
| | Spring | 11 | 9.3% | 38 | 32.2% | 40 | 33.9% | 29 | 24.6% | 118 |
| Replacement behaviors (e.g., reading performance targets, homework completion targets) are clearly identified. | Fall | 20 | 17.1% | 61 | 52.1% | 32 | 27.4% | 4 | 3.4% | 117 |
| | Spring | 12 | 10.2% | 43 | 36.4% | 41 | 34.7% | 22 | 18.6% | 118 |
| Problem analysis is conducted using available data and evidence-based hypotheses. | Fall | 19 | 16.2% | 62 | 53.0% | 29 | 24.8% | 7 | 6.0% | 117 |
| | Spring | 5 | 4.2% | 40 | 33.9% | 44 | 37.3% | 29 | 24.6% | 118 |
| Intervention plans include evidence-based (e.g., research-based, data-based) strategies. | Fall | 10 | 8.5% | 54 | 46.2% | 45 | 38.5% | 8 | 6.8% | 117 |
| | Spring | 4 | 3.4% | 31 | 26.3% | 52 | 44.1% | 31 | 26.3% | 118 |
| Intervention support personnel are identified and scheduled for all interventions. | Fall | 14 | 12.0% | 57 | 48.7% | 39 | 33.3% | 7 | 6.0% | 117 |
| | Spring | 4 | 3.4% | 36 | 30.5% | 46 | 39.0% | 32 | 27.1% | 118 |
| Intervention integrity is documented. | Fall | 23 | 19.5% | 75 | 63.6% | 18 | 15.3% | 2 | 1.7% | 118 |
| | Spring | 11 | 9.4% | 45 | 38.5% | 36 | 30.8% | 25 | 21.4% | 117 |
| Response to intervention is evaluated through systematic data collection. | Fall | 20 | 16.9% | 63 | 53.4% | 32 | 27.1% | 3 | 2.5% | 118 |
| | Spring | 5 | 4.2% | 37 | 31.4% | 44 | 37.3% | 32 | 27.1% | 118 |
| Changes are made to intervention based on student response. | Fall | 13 | 11.0% | 63 | 53.4% | 39 | 33.1% | 3 | 2.5% | 118 |
| | Spring | 6 | 5.2% | 35 | 30.4% | 42 | 36.5% | 32 | 27.8% | 115 |
| Parents are routinely involved in implementation of interventions. | Fall | 21 | 17.9% | 59 | 50.4% | 31 | 26.5% | 6 | 5.1% | 117 |
| | Spring | 11 | 9.3% | 43 | 36.4% | 36 | 30.5% | 28 | 23.7% | 118 |

PROBLEM IS DEFINED AS A DATA-BASED DISCREPANCY (GAP ANALYSIS) BETWEEN WHAT IS EXPECTED AND WHAT IS OCCURRING (INCLUDES PEER AND BENCHMARK DATA).

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 32 to 69 for a total of 58.5%. Comments suggested variability in the degree to which implementation of GAP analysis was a commonly used practice.

- *Problem is defined according to GAP Analysis each and every time.*
- *Consistently for Tier 3 problem solving teams, but not for other teams*
- *Done for academic, not for behavior.*
- *We are improving our Problem ID skills.*
- *When we have students in need of this we are doing this practice.*
- *Utilizing the process of a GAP analysis will be a focus for the 2011/12 school year.*

Results suggest that schools need more practice implementing GAP analysis across tiers for behavior and academics for each type of team.

REPLACEMENT BEHAVIORS (E.G., READING PERFORMANCE TARGETS, HOMEWORK COMPLETION TARGETS) ARE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 36 to 63 for a total of 53.3%. 23 schools provided mostly brief comments in response to this item. Comments suggest there may be uncertainty with regard to the degree to which replacement behaviors are clearly identified

- *mostly for Tier 3*
- *See FBA's*
- *Need to improve match replacement behavior to problem behavior*
- *refining processes*
- *When we have students in need of this we are doing this practice.*

PROBLEM ANALYSIS IS CONDUCTED USING AVAILABLE DATA AND EVIDENCE-BASED HYPOTHESES.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 36 to 73 for a total of 61.9%. Again, 24 schools provided mostly brief comments. Many were focused only on Tier 3 data.

- *achieved for tier 3, especially academic*
- *Again, we do this at Tier III yet less at Tier I or Tier II.*
- *mostly for Tier 3*
- *Tier 3/ individual students only*
- *Team is able to analyze problems at the Tier 3 level.*

INTERVENTION PLANS INCLUDE EVIDENCE-BASED (E.G., RESEARCH-BASED, DATA-BASED) STRATEGIES.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 53 to 83 for a total of 70.4%. Comments mirrored earlier statements regarding the need for assistance with evidence based strategies for Math and Behavior.

- *In reading Oldsmar has made significant strides however in mathematics and writing it is still a work in progress.*
- *Behavior interventions are not always implemented as well as they should be however the academic interventions are implemented with fidelity.*
- *Need more for math.*

However, a subgroup of comments suggests that some schools view the inclusion of evidenced-based strategies as a strength.

- *All interventions are research-based*

- *Teams use research-based and evidence-based programs and strategies. Data is collected to determine the effectiveness of selected programs and strategies.*
- *As previously stated, we pull from a list of evidence-based strategies to use as interventions.*

INTERVENTION SUPPORT PERSONNEL ARE IDENTIFIED AND SCHEDULED FOR ALL INTERVENTIONS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 46 to 78 for a total of 66.1%. Comments highlighted concerns regarding the impact of budget cuts on personnel.

- *We are extremely concerned about the loss of some of our personnel that are highly trained and have shown effective interventions*
- *We have lost Title 1, and have no clear directive from district on how to replicate these supports.*
- *It is always a challenge to provide the proper support for interventions and with continued cuts in personnel it will be even more of a challenge next school year.*
- *With continued cuts to personnel, those needed to support these intensive interventions are more difficult to schedule or find.*

Difficulties with follow-through and consistency across intervention domains were also noted.

- *Academically We need to work on the behavior aspect.*
- *in Reading; not in math*
- *Fidelity of support implementation could improve- this often is inconsistently implemented.*
- *Some support personnel are identified*
- *Sometimes personnel is not identified before plan is written due to scheduling conflicts*
- *We need to better support in regards to follow-up/consulting with intervention teachers.*
- *Work on training of intervention providers*

INTERVENTION INTEGRITY IS DOCUMENTED.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 20 to 61 for a total of 52.2%. This was the lowest percentage Achieved of all the Problem Solving items in both the Fall and the Spring. Although improvement in ratings were evident from Fall to Spring, comments suggested that monitoring of intervention integrity mainly takes place for Tier 3 if at all. Improved documentation of intervention integrity is necessary.

- *Fidelity and Integrity are documented as frequently as time allows.*
- *Implementation of Tier 3 interventions are observed for fidelity.*
- *Behavior intervention implementation is still a struggle for teachers.*
- *Tier 3 achieved, Tier 1 & 2 still in progress*
- *Fidelity checks in place for Tier 3; working to develop more feedback for Tier 1 and 2.*
- *Currently limited to FBA's. Attempts are being made to document intervention integrity in extended learning.*

A subset of schools note this as a strength and can be used as a model for others.

- *Consistently maintained and reviewed by members of the SBLT. Implementation logs are reviewed to insure delivery of intervention. Observations of interventions are completed to document that interventions are delivered as designed.*
- *We keep logs of Tier III and Tier II kids receiving interventions including length of time they received the intervention.*
- *Observations, intervention documentation sheets*

RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION IS EVALUATED THROUGH SYSTEMATIC DATA COLLECTION.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 35 to 76 for a total of 64.4%. Schools In Progress noted that data collection was not consistent across tiers. Assessment of RtI at Tier 2 may be particularly challenging. Comments suggested that schools become more comfortable with the process with increased practice.

- *Academic and behavior data collection is maintained in tier 3; however, collection of data at tier 2 is in progress.*
- *Achieved for Tier 3 and for PSW and FBA students and the SBLT team is working on improving the process for Tier 2.*
- *Tier 1 & 3 is achieved. Tier 2 is still in progress*
- *Tier 3 only*
- *Is more systematic this year*
- *Achieved for Tier 3 and for PSW and FBA students and the SBLT team is working on improving the process for Tier 2.*

CHANGES ARE MADE TO INTERVENTION BASED ON STUDENT RESPONSE.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 42 to 74 for a total of 64.3%. Only 24 comments were given in response to this item, with some suggesting difficulty in the degree to which interventions are adjusted based upon data.

- *Data is not always evaluated in a timely manner to facilitate modifications in interventions.*
- *Due to limited resources, we struggle with making changes to interventions for individual kids. There are other kids in the group who do not need their intervention changed but there are no staff available to provide a different intervention*
- *Need to move more quickly when considering changing interventions.*
- *Tier 3 in place, Not consistently happening with fidelity at Tier 2 or Tier 1 level*
- *Tier 3 only*

Schools with stronger systems may serve as models for others to follow.

- *The effectiveness of interventions is reviewed through ongoing progress monitoring. Changes are made to interventions when questionable or poor responses are presented through graphed data.*
- *Weekly level team meetings are held to evaluate progress and amend academic and behavior plans accordingly.*
- *Data is collected, monitored and drives any changes needed.*
- *Changes are made at every PSW and FBA review if necessary*

PARENTS ARE ROUTINELY INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERVENTIONS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 37 to 64 for a total of 54.2%. Schools who rated this item as either In Progress or Achieved noted that parents are invited to participate in all Tier 3 meetings. Ratings appeared to be based upon the schools' interpretation of whether this satisfied the criteria of this question. Further clarification concerning the role of parents in the PS/RtI framework can be helpful for schools districtwide.

Table 21: Total number of Implementation: Effective Problem Solving Procedures items rated as Achieved or Maintaining

| | 0 | | 1 to 3 | | 4 to 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | Total |
|--------|----|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|---|------|----|-------|----|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Fall | 44 | 37.3% | 30 | 25.4% | 22 | 18.6% | 9 | 7.6% | 4 | 3.4% | 9 | 7.6% | 118 |
| Spring | 17 | 14.4% | 18 | 15.3% | 27 | 22.9% | 7 | 5.9% | 18 | 15.3% | 31 | 26.3% | 118 |

The number of schools rating all 9 Problem Solving items as Achieved/Maintained increased from 9 in the Fall to 31 in the Spring.

Overall, these process items reflect the degree to which PS/RtI has become a way of work in each school. Consistent with this view is that five of the six pilot schools endorsed all 9 items as having been Achieved. These items reflect the degree to which teams have had practice with the PS/RtI approach. Schools with less practice at the bottom of the table below also have low scores across the SAPSI.

| Table 22: Total Effective Problem Solving items Achieved by School | | |
|--|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Anona Elementary | 4 | 9 |
| Azalea Elementary | 3 | 9 |
| Bauder Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Belleair Elementary | 8 | 9 |
| Blanton Elementary | 2 | 9 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 6 | 9 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 0 | 9 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 3 | 9 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 0 | 9 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 3 | 9 |
| Lynch Elementary | 5 | 9 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 3 | 9 |
| New Heights Elementary | 7 | 9 |
| North Shore Elementary | 7 | 9 |
| Northwest Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 8 | 9 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 7 | 9 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 8 | 9 |
| Plumb Elementary | 0 | 9 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 7 | 9 |
| San Jose Elementary | 1 | 9 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 8 | 9 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| St. Petersburg High | 0 | 9 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 1 | 9 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 2 | 9 |
| Westgate Elementary | 7 | 9 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 9 | 9 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Frontier Elementary | 2 | 8 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 7 | 8 |
| Maximo Elementary | 7 | 8 |
| Ozona Elementary | 3 | 8 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 7 | 8 |
| Perkins Elementary | 4 | 8 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 2 | 8 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 1 | 8 |
| Seminole High | 7 | 8 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 0 | 8 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 2 | 8 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 5 | 8 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 0 | 7 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 5 | 7 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 6 | 7 |
| Osceola Middle | 2 | 7 |
| Seminole Middle | 2 | 7 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 4 | 7 |
| Tyrone Middle | 0 | 7 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 6 |
| Belcher Elementary | 1 | 6 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 0 | 6 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 6 | 6 |
| High Point Elementary | 1 | 6 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 6 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 2 | 6 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 0 | 6 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Nina Harris | 4 | 6 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 6 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 2 | 6 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 5 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 6 | 5 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 3 | 5 |
| Hamilton Disston | 0 | 5 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 0 | 5 |
| Seminole Elementary | 4 | 5 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 6 | 5 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 6 | 4 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 0 | 4 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Osceola High | 1 | 4 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Pinellas Park High | 0 | 4 |
| Starkey Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 0 | 3 |
| Skyview Elementary | 9 | 3 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 2 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 1 | 2 |
| Largo High | 0 | 2 |
| Melrose Elementary | 6 | 2 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 2 |
| Azalea Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Bay Point Middle | 4 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 4 | 1 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 4 | 1 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 2 | 1 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 5 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Bayside High | 2 | 0 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 0 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 0 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 0 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 3 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Gibbs High | 0 | 0 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 4 | 0 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 9 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2.86 | 5.43 |

EFFECTIVE PROBLEM SOLVING SUMMARY

These items represent the degree to which PS/RtI is a way of work at each school. Those schools with more practice and time dedicated to implementation of the PS/RtI framework have higher ratings on these items. For example, five of the six pilot schools rated all nine items as Achieved. As regular SBLT meetings are scheduled, Data Days are identified, a system for collecting data is defined, evidence-based practices are selected and implemented etc. practice with problem solving will improve upon this foundation.

Once each school has a clearly defined means of data collection, practice will allow more than the current 69 schools to cite mastery with GAP analysis. Specific attention to identification of replacement behaviors in training will allow more than the current 63 schools to state that these are clearly identified. Training with problem analysis across all three-tiers using schools' own data systems is necessary to increase Achievement of problem analysis above the current 73 schools who report doing so. The inclusion of evidence-based strategies in intervention plans will improve as Tier 2 math and behavior supports and evidence-based practices for Tier 3 are more clearly identified and implemented.

Intervention support personnel must be more clearly identified districtwide beyond the 78 schools who report doing so. The district must utilize involvement of RtI Coaches to address implementation issues at the school level and build upon areas that are not currently Achieved. Budget cuts may also affect implementation in the coming year. Nevertheless, schools must be able to identify a plan that can be implemented given available resources.

Improvement of documentation of intervention integrity is also necessary. Schools that have an established evidence-based intervention system across all three tiers can focus their SIPs upon measurement of implementation integrity. Other schools who have yet to identify and implement evidence-based systems may target this as an area for improvement after systems are chosen and implemented.

Many schools state that RtI is evaluated through systematic data collection for Tier 3. Those who have established systems across tiers should focus attention upon their methods of evaluating students' RtI through systematic data collection across tiers. Similarly, implementing changes to intervention based upon student response as measured via data is a more advanced implementation target that can be the focus of schools who have mastered implementation of the foundation components of PS/RtI.

Many schools noted that parents are invited to meetings to plan interventions for students at Tier 3. Schools may benefit from further training to establish means of parent involvement in implementation of interventions. This can be discussed in conjunction with issues of confidentiality and communication among SBLTs, SACs, and PTAs.

IMPLEMENTATION: SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM ACTIVITY

| Table 23: Implementation: School-Based Leadership Team activity | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | | Not Started | | In Progress | | Achieved | | Maintaining | | Total |
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| A strategic plan (implementation plan) exists and is used by the School-Based Leadership Team to guide implementation of PS/Rtl. | Fall | 29 | 24.8% | 61 | 52.1% | 24 | 20.5% | 3 | 2.6% | 117 |
| | Spring | 12 | 10.2% | 58 | 49.2% | 35 | 29.7% | 13 | 11.0% | 118 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year to review data and implementation issues. | Fall | 24 | 20.3% | 29 | 24.6% | 50 | 42.4% | 15 | 12.7% | 118 |
| | Spring | 3 | 2.5% | 26 | 22.0% | 50 | 42.4% | 39 | 33.1% | 118 |
| The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year with the District Leadership Team to review data and implementation issues. | Fall | 55 | 47.0% | 36 | 30.8% | 18 | 15.4% | 8 | 6.8% | 117 |
| | Spring | 26 | 22.0% | 30 | 25.4% | 40 | 33.9% | 22 | 18.6% | 118 |
| Changes are made to the implementation plan as a result of school and district leadership team data-based decisions. | Fall | 47 | 39.8% | 44 | 37.3% | 23 | 19.5% | 4 | 3.4% | 118 |
| | Spring | 27 | 22.9% | 45 | 38.1% | 28 | 23.7% | 18 | 15.3% | 118 |
| Feedback on the outcomes of the PS/Rtl Project is provided to school-based faculty and staff at least yearly. | Fall | 54 | 46.2% | 32 | 27.4% | 23 | 19.7% | 8 | 6.8% | 117 |
| | Spring | 28 | 24.1% | 45 | 38.8% | 26 | 22.4% | 17 | 14.7% | 116 |

A STRATEGIC PLAN (IMPLEMENTATION PLAN) EXISTS AND IS USED BY THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM TO GUIDE IMPLEMENTATION OF PS/RTL.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 27 to 48 for a total of 40.7%. Achievement of this component should be 100% and documented in each school’s SIP. An implementation plan represents the degree to which each school envisions the ‘big picture’ and breaks down its component parts. Through doing so, the school can take action steps to implement each component of the framework.

- *Plan exists; however, is not currently documented or written down.*
- *some plans in place*
- *The SBLT will create a document indentifying the plan beginning next year.*
- *Trainings provided by the district*
- *Need a multi-year plan. Not just an annual plan.*
- *We have isolated plans for certain areas (i.e. ODR plan, Attendance plan, 4th & 5th grade plan, etc.) but need to bring overarching alignment and consensus on goals and plans for PS/Rtl across all areas.*
- *We have a plan, but needs improvement and to address more than the current year.*
- *See strategic plan exists but not necessarily used by SBLT.*

Comments suggest that district trainings have addressed this issue. Yet further support is necessary given that 40.7% rate this component as Achieved.

- *We have worked on action plans at district meetings*
- *A strategic plan is used from the district to guide the implementation of PS/RTI. A multi-year plan is being developed by this school based leadership team that will include consensus, infrastructure, and implementation plans.*
- *As documented in SIP and Action Plan created at PS/Rtl training*

THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETS AT LEAST TWICE EACH YEAR TO REVIEW DATA AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 65 to 89 for a total of 75.5%. Many of the SBLTs meet weekly. It is unclear why the remaining schools did not state that this component was Achieved. They may believe that their data review is insufficient or they may not meet. More precise questions are needed to determine whether a) a SBLT is established, and b) how often they meet at each school. These can be documented in each school's implementation plan. SAPSI items were not a good source of information concerning these basic processes due to the wording of the items.

THE SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETS AT LEAST TWICE EACH YEAR WITH THE DISTRICT LEADERSHIP TEAM TO REVIEW DATA AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 26 to 62 for a total of 52.5%. Many schools who rate this item as Achieved cite the four district level trainings attended by the SBLTs. Other schools cite these trainings yet express a need for further support.

- *All of the meetings at the district level have been with a group of other schools and there hasn't been DLT members there to do one-to-one PDSA with each school.*
- *The school based leadership team meets with the district PS/RTI trainers concerning implementation. Some sessions deal with behavior issues and do not pertain to our group of students.*
- *Based on our needs we have not met with District Leadership team.*
- *Not put in place at this time.*
- *The District Leadership Team has not met with the School-Based Leadership Team, nor have they asked to meet with us.*
- *We have not yet met with the district leadership team.*

Through review of the school-level SAPSI data throughout this report and summarized at the end, there is a range of implementation across schools. District Leadership can target schools whose ratings indicate less advanced implementation and provide targeted support.

CHANGES ARE MADE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AS A RESULT OF SCHOOL AND DISTRICT LEADERSHIP TEAM DATA-BASED DECISIONS.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 27 to 46 for a total of 39%. This percentage will increase as district leadership work with individual schools to address their specific needs.

- *We have not yet met with the district leadership teams in order to make changes.*
- *District input is available at PS/Rtl trainings. Region meetings with principals allow for additional discussion of problem solving. District team members have not observed the Eisenhower SBLT meetings.*
- *School leadership decisions are in place but not district level.*
- *We have not met with district leadership, but changes are made to implementation plan based on school needs and data.*

- *This does not occur as a routine process.*

District level trainings appear to have been effective as evidenced by the increases across all components of the SAPSI. However, targeted supports are necessary to address barriers to implementation at the school level for those who require extra support. All SAPSI data can be reviewed with each school during individual support sessions and implementation issues in each area can be addressed.

FEEDBACK ON THE OUTCOMES OF THE PS/RTI PROJECT IS PROVIDED TO SCHOOL-BASED FACULTY AND STAFF AT LEAST YEARLY.

The number of schools Achieving this item increased from 31 to 43 for a total of 37.1%. Schools require a systematic plan for how to do this.

- Not systematic or comprehensive, but it occurs on occasion
- We give feedback to our Discipline Committee, which is made up of faculty representatives and our SAC committee. We probably need to start giving it to the Faculty as a whole.
- Working on a process to deliver information.
- Not a routine process.
- Not too sure how to respond
- We do not provide feedback to the staff on the PS/RTI Project in faculty meetings.
- This school has not been given information about the outcomes from the Rtl Pilot Project schools.
- We have not heard about any outcomes of the PS/Rtl Project

This report represents feedback concerning the PS/Rtl Project. Schools can review this document to compare their progress in relation to other schools and to examine current implementation issues for the district as a whole. Tables from this document or based upon their own responses to the SAPSI can be provided to faculty. The evaluation process should be used to provide feedback. It should also be used as a basis upon which plans for continued improvement are made. The goals for next year outlined at the conclusion of this evaluation can only occur if schools are aware of them and take specific actions to achieve goals that support implementation of the PS/Rtl framework districtwide.

Table 24: Total number of Implementation: School-Based Leadership Team activity items rated as Achieved or Maintaining

| | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | Total |
|--------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N |
| Fall | 46 | 39.0% | 25 | 21.2% | 16 | 13.6% | 13 | 11.0% | 10 | 8.5% | 8 | 6.8% | 118 |
| Spring | 19 | 16.1% | 20 | 16.9% | 24 | 20.3% | 18 | 15.3% | 19 | 16.1% | 18 | 15.3% | 118 |

Results indicate that the number of schools implementing all 5 SBLT implementation components increased from 8 in the Fall to 18 in the Spring. These results must improve as these items represent an important PDSA process among schools and district leadership to improve implementation of the PS/Rtl framework districtwide.

Five of the six pilot schools rated each item as Achieved. These results suggest that these crucial items are achieved at schools that are further advanced in their implementation of the PS/Rtl framework.

| Table 25: Total SBLT Implementation items Achieved by School | | |
|--|------|--------|
| | Fall | Spring |
| Anona Elementary | 0 | 5 |
| Bauder Elementary | 3 | 5 |
| Bear Creek Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Belcher Elementary | 2 | 5 |
| Blanton Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 5 | 5 |
| Frontier Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 0 | 5 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 4 | 5 |
| Maximo Elementary | 2 | 5 |
| New Heights Elementary | 4 | 5 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 1 | 5 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 4 | 5 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 2 | 5 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 0 | 5 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 3 | 5 |
| Azalea Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Belleair Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 1 | 4 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Hamilton Disston | 1 | 4 |
| High Point Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Northwest Elementary | 5 | 4 |
| Osceola High | 5 | 4 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 3 | 4 |
| Seminole High | 4 | 4 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 5 | 4 |
| St. Petersburg High | 1 | 4 |
| Starkey Elementary | 0 | 4 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 4 | 4 |
| Westgate Elementary | 2 | 4 |
| Bay Point Middle | 2 | 3 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 1 | 3 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Bayside High | 5 | 3 |
| Boca Ciega High | 0 | 3 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 3 | 3 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 2 | 3 |
| Largo High | 0 | 3 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 3 | 3 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 1 | 3 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 4 | 3 |
| Ozona Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Perkins Elementary | 0 | 3 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 1 | 3 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 3 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 2 | 3 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 1 | 3 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 2 | 3 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 0 | 2 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 0 | 2 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 0 | 2 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Nina Harris | 4 | 2 |
| North Shore Elementary | 4 | 2 |
| Northeast High | 0 | 2 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 0 | 2 |
| Osceola Middle | 1 | 2 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 2 | 2 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 2 | 2 |
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 0 | 2 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 0 | 2 |
| Seminole Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 1 | 2 |
| Tyrone Middle | 3 | 2 |
| Azalea Middle | 1 | 1 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 1 |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Countryside High | 0 | 1 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 0 | 1 |
| Gibbs High | 2 | 1 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 2 | 1 |
| Lynch Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Melrose Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 1 | 1 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 3 | 1 |
| Plumb Elementary | 3 | 1 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Seminole Elementary | 2 | 1 |
| Skyview Elementary | 5 | 1 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 0 | 1 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 1 | 1 |
| Clearwater High | 0 | 0 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Dunedin High | 0 | 0 |
| East Lake High | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 4 | 0 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood High | 0 | 0 |
| Largo Middle | 0 | 0 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 5 | 0 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 0 | 0 |
| Pinellas Park High | 2 | 0 |
| San Jose Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 0 | 0 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 1.49 | 2.44 |

SBLT IMPLEMENTATION SUMMARY

Only 48 schools stated that a strategic plan exists and is used by the SBLT to guide implementation of PS/RtI. All schools should document goals with regard to PS/RtI implementation on the SIP. Achievement of this objective should be a goal for all schools for this year. Importantly, these goals should be used to guide implementation and progress toward goals should be monitored throughout the year. The PS/RtI framework depends upon having clearly identified, systemized processes. Setting explicit, mutually agreed upon goals among SBLT members represents an important first step in this process for the coming year.

To develop a plan the SBLT must be established and meet regularly, preferably weekly. They should also receive guidance concerning what steps are necessary to include in their strategic plan to implement successfully in the coming year. Using the results of this evaluation combined with the individual results of each school's SAPSI, areas for improvement can be identified by each school in the Fall of 2011 and specific action steps can be placed on the SIP. Progress made at each school can then be reviewed collaboratively among school and district leadership in the Spring of 2012. Providing feedback concerning the outcomes of the PS/RtI project included in this report as well as each school's own data is an essential component of this process.

TOTAL SAPSI ITEMS ACHIEVED WITH SUBSCALES BY SCHOOL

Table 26: Total SAPSI items Achieved with Subscales by School

| | Consensus | Data | Special Education | Evidence-Based Practices | SBLT Infrastructure | Academic Three-Tiered System | Behavioral Three-Tiered System | Problem-Solving | SBLT Implementation | Total Spring SAPSI |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Bear Creek Elementary | 5 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 42 |
| Blanton Elementary | 5 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 42 |
| Woodlawn Elementary | 5 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 42 |
| Curlew Creek Elementary | 5 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 42 |
| Oakhurst Elementary | 4 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 41 |
| Anona Elementary | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 40 |
| Bauder Elementary | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 40 |
| Paul B. Stephens Exceptional | 5 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 40 |
| Skycrest Elementary | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 40 |
| Northwest Elementary | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 40 |
| Campbell Park Elementary | 2 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 39 |
| Belleair Elementary | 4 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 38 |
| Bay Point Elementary | 4 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 38 |
| Seminole High | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 37 |
| Eisenhower Elementary | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 37 |
| Lakewood Elementary | 4 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 36 |
| New Heights Elementary | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 36 |
| Frontier Elementary | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 36 |
| Azalea Elementary | 3 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 36 |
| Dunedin Elementary | 5 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 36 |
| Ozona Elementary | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 36 |
| North Shore Elementary | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 36 |
| Marjorie K. Rawlings Elementary | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 35 |

Total SAPSI items Achieved with Subscales by School (Table 26 continued)

| | Consensus | Data | Special Education | Evidence-Based Practices | SBLT Infrastructure | Academic Three-Tiered System | Behavioral Three-Tiered System | Problem-Solving | SBLT Implementation | Total Spring SAPSI |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Forest Lakes Elementary | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 35 |
| St. Petersburg High | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 35 |
| Ponce de Leon Elementary | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 35 |
| Pinellas Central Elementary | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 35 |
| San Jose Elementary | 3 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 35 |
| Sandy Lane Elementary | 4 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 34 |
| Westgate Elementary | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 34 |
| James Sanderlin Elementary | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 34 |
| Tarpon Springs Fundamental | 4 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 34 |
| Lakeview Fundamental Elementary | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 33 |
| Perkins Elementary | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 33 |
| Richard L. Sanders Exceptional | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 33 |
| Lake St. George Elementary | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 33 |
| Sawgrass Lake Elementary | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 32 |
| Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 32 |
| Thurgood Marshal Middle | 2 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 32 |
| Sutherland Elementary | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 32 |
| Walsingham Elementary | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 31 |
| Orange Grove Elementary | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 31 |
| Osceola Middle | 4 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 31 |
| Clearwater Intermediate | 4 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 31 |
| Lynch Elementary | 1 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 31 |
| Lealman Avenue Elementary | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 31 |
| Belcher Elementary | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 30 |
| High Point Elementary | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 30 |
| Starkey Elementary | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 30 |
| Brooker Creek Elementary | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 30 |
| Madeira Beach Fundamental Middle | 3 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 30 |
| Doug Jamerson Elementary | 4 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 30 |

Total SAPSI items Achieved with Subscales by School (Table 26 continued)

| | Consensus | Data | Special Education | Evidence-Based Practices | SBLT Infrastructure | Academic Three-Tiered System | Behavioral Three-Tiered System | Problem-Solving | SBLT Implementation | Total Spring SAPSI |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Pinellas Park Elementary | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 30 |
| Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 29 |
| Ridgecrest Elementary | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 29 |
| Cypress Woods Elementary | 2 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 29 |
| Maximo Elementary | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 28 |
| Sunset Hills Elementary | 4 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 28 |
| Plumb Elementary | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 28 |
| Morgan Fitzgerald Middle | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 27 |
| Mount Vernon Elementary | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 26 |
| Tarpon Springs Middle | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
| Tyrone Middle | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 24 |
| Oak Grove Middle | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 24 |
| Bardmoor Elementary | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 24 |
| Pasadena Fundamental Elementary | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 24 |
| John M. Sexton Elementary | 2 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 24 |
| Cross Bayou Elementary | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 23 |
| Seminole Middle | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 22 |
| Highland Lakes Elementary | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 22 |
| Oldsmar Elementary | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 22 |
| Tarpon Springs Elementary | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 22 |
| Shore Acres Elementary | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 22 |
| Safety Harbor Elementary | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 21 |
| Garrison-Jones Elementary | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 21 |
| Fuguitt Elementary | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 20 |
| Dunedin Highland Middle | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| Hamilton Disston | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 19 |
| Boca Ciega High | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 19 |
| Nina Harris | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 19 |
| Seminole Elementary | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 19 |

Total SAPSI items Achieved with Subscales by School (Table 26 continued)

| | Consensus | Data | Special Education | Evidence-Based Practices | SBLT Infrastructure | Academic Three-Tiered System | Behavioral Three-Tiered System | Problem-Solving | SBLT Implementation | Total Spring SAPSI |
|--|-----------|------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Melrose Elementary | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 19 |
| Osceola High | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 18 |
| Calvin Hunsinger | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 18 |
| Southern Oak Elementary | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 18 |
| Leila G. Davis Elementary | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 17 |
| Skyview Elementary | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 17 |
| Curtis Fundamental Elementary | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 17 |
| Bayside High | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 16 |
| Safety Harbor Middle | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| McMullen Booth Elementary | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| Largo High | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
| Palm Harbor Middle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 14 |
| Countryside High | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| Pinellas Park Middle | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| Hospital Homebound/PCS Virtual/Tele School | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Dixie M. Hollins High | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| Joseph L. Carwise Middle | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| Gibbs High | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| Northeast High | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| Lealman Intermediate | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| Gulfport Elementary | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| Pinellas Park High | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 11 |
| Pinellas Secondary | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Palm Harbor University High | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Clearwater High | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Tarpon Springs High | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Bay Point Middle | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| Azalea Middle | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |

| Total SAPSI items Achieved with Subscales by School (Table 26 continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Consensus | Data | Special Education | Evidence-Based Practices | SBLT Infrastructure | Academic Three-Tiered System | Behavioral Three-Tiered System | Problem-Solving | SBLT Implementation | Total Spring SAPSI |
| Clearwater Middle Fundamental | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| John Hopkins Middle | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Fairmont Park Elementary | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| East Lake High | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Meadowlawn Middle | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Largo Middle | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Mildred Helms Elementary | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Dunedin High | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Lakewood High | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Mean | 2.42 | 5.32 | 1.25 | 1.88 | 2.07 | 2.15 | 1.63 | 5.43 | 2.44 | 24.58 |
| Total Standard Deviation | 1.41 | 2.70 | 0.88 | 1.20 | 1.30 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 3.35 | 1.68 | 11.39 |

Data from this table can be used by each school to compare their self-reported implementation as assessed by the SAPSI relative to other schools in the district. Schools can compare their Achievement levels to district means both overall and by each separate area. Schools can then set goals for their strategic plan based upon their current level of implementation. District leadership can identify schools that may require more individualized assistance based upon their reports of having Achieved fewer components of the PS/RtI framework.

These data suggest that particular attention is necessary with regard to construction of the PS/RtI framework at district middle and high schools. Data also indicate that implementation levels are reported to be among the highest at the district's six pilot schools.

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

HAS IMPLEMENTATION IMPROVED DURING THE COURSE OF THE 2010-2011 SCHOOL YEAR?

Yes. Implementation has improved as assessed by school's self-ratings. Ratings across almost all items of the SAPSI showed increases in the number of schools rating each component as having been achieved. Comments suggested that supports provided by district leadership including multiple SBLT trainings, provision of a resource/intervention map, and visits to individual schools, supported improvement of implementation districtwide.

IS THERE A RANGE OF IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS OR ARE ALL SCHOOLS CLOSE TOGETHER IN TERMS OF THEIR IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL?

SAPSI results suggest that there is a wide range of implementation levels districtwide. Data evident in the final table of this report highlights a broad range of ratings from schools who rate almost all SAPSI items as Achieved to schools who rate almost all SAPSI items as not yet Achieved. These data can be used by district leaders and schools themselves to identify those who may benefit from targeted assistance to achieve implementation of components of the PS/Rtl framework in the coming year.

HAVE THE PILOT SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTED THE PS/RTI FRAMEWORK EFFECTIVELY?

Yes. Pilot schools provided ratings suggesting that the many components of the PS/Rtl framework have been achieved. While observational methods would provide additional information, these ratings provide support for effective implementation at each of the six pilot schools. Processes at each of the six pilot schools may be replicated at other schools districtwide.

ARE THERE DIFFERENCES IN IMPLEMENTATION ACROSS GRADE LEVELS?

Yes. Data consistently indicated that elementary schools rated components of their PS/Rtl framework as having been Achieved more often than did middle or high schools. A focus for the coming year should be to ensure that core components of PS/Rtl framework are in place at the middle and high school levels in particular.

WHAT GOALS SHOULD BE ACHIEVED DURING THE 2011-2012 SCHOOL YEAR?

1. The District will communicate monthly with all schools via an online update. The update will provide information regarding PS/Rtl resources necessary to meet Goals 2 through 8. It will also serve as a forum to communicate additional information relevant to PS/Rtl implementation.
2. 100% of schools should document goals with regard to PS/Rtl implementation in their SIP.
3. 100% of schools should have a SBLT that meets regularly, preferably weekly to discuss PS/Rtl implementation.
4. 100% of schools should be able to define the means through which school wide data are collected through an efficient and effective process.
5. 100% of schools should be able to clearly define and implement their schoolwide Behavior Plan.
6. 100% of schools should be able to select and implement evidence –based practices across all three tiers for both Academic and Behavior domains.
7. 70% of schools should have a clearly defined process whereby parent input is solicited for the problem solving process.
8. 70% of schools should conduct data meetings to focus attention on their data collection and analysis.

41% of schools stated that a strategic plan exists and is used by the school-based leadership team to guide implementation of PS/RtI. All schools should document goals with regard to PS/RtI implementation on their SIP at the start of the year and use these as a working document to guide implementation and track progress. Specifying the means through which each SBLT will meet regularly to assess progress in accord with the goals stated on the SIP is also an essential first step.

76% of schools stated that data were collected through an efficient and effective systematic process. 56% stated that these data were used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic programs and 41% stated that these data were used to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs. This is the core assessment framework of PS/RtI and must be implemented across all schools.

67% of schools stated that Tier 1 Behavioral Core instruction was clearly identified. Each school should be able to effectively implement a clearly defined core behavior program. Supports can be provided at the district level and examples can be shared concerning how to do this effectively. This should be achieved by all schools by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

66% of schools stated that Academic supplemental instruction was clearly identified and 34% of schools stated that Behavioral supplemental instruction was clearly identified. 71% of schools stated that Academic intensive strategies were evidenced based and 64% stated that Behavior intensive strategies were evidence based. By year end all schools should be able to select and implement evidence-based practices across all three tiers for both Academic and Behavior domains. This is the core intervention framework of PS/RtI and must be implemented across all schools.

32% of schools stated that the school based leadership team involves parents. Data reviewed throughout this evaluation highlighted concerns regarding confidentiality and the need for guidance concerning means of involving parents effectively in the PS/RtI framework. District level information and supports can be provided to schools to assist them in improvement of the means through which parents are involved.

41% of schools stated that the SBLT has regularly scheduled data day meetings to evaluate tier 1 and tier 2 data. Establishment of this process districtwide can help focus attention upon improving the assessment components of the PS/RtI framework and meeting goal 4 wherein schoolwide data are collected through an efficient and effective process.

Each of these goals is attainable at all schools. A subset of schools may have accomplished each of these goals. These schools can identify goals associated with more advanced integration of data and intervention components of the PS/RtI framework. For example, schools with established intervention and data analysis components at each tier should focus attention on data collection to document intervention integrity. Initial meetings to set goals for the School Improvement Plan can identify more advanced targets for these schools.

There are many schools that have not accomplished all of these foundation components and should be able to do so by the conclusion of the coming year. Focused attention is necessary to assure that each of these components is in place at each school in the coming year. Effective communication through monthly online updates can help schools focus on each of these goals and provide resources necessary to meet them. Provision of trainings throughout the year should also focus upon assisting each school to meet these goals when progress toward each of them is assessed at the conclusion of the 2011-2012 school year.