

Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) Evaluation

Perceptions of Problem Solving/Response to
Intervention Skills Survey Results

Research and Accountability

Pinellas County Schools

5/20/2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Method.....	3
Results.....	4
Scale Means Overall and by Job Classification.....	4
Scale Means by SBLT Membership.....	5
Training.....	6
Mean Training Types Attended.....	6
Training Participation by Job Classification.....	7
Perceived Skill by Training for General Education Teachers.....	9
Comments.....	10
Personnel Resources.....	10
Administrative Support.....	11
Communication.....	11
Implementation.....	12
Training.....	13
Replication.....	13
School-Level Means.....	14
Conclusions.....	17
Recommendations.....	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents results of the 2011 administration of the Perceptions of PS/RtI Skills Survey across Pinellas County Schools. This survey assesses respondents' perceptions of their PS/RtI skills with respect to Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation domains. Comments were also solicited from respondents to provide feedback that may facilitate implementation of the PS/RtI framework.

Perceptions Survey results were similar to those obtained during the 2010 administration. Psychological Services personnel and Administrators reported the highest skill levels, while teachers' scores suggested that they have PS/RtI skills but need support to use them.

Low response rates (N = 334 overall) prohibited analysis at the school level. Only 8 schools had more than 10 participants. Only 2 PS/RtI coaches participated, which did not allow for an assessment of the perceived skill level of this group.

Results suggested that PLC and faculty meeting trainings, as well as district SBLT trainings can provide a foundation of knowledge with respect to the PS/RtI framework. However, more intensive interventions such as those provided via Moodle are likely necessary to reach a skill level where individuals require little support. Hands-on training, where SBLTs and administrators are guided through the process of setting up the PS/RtI framework at their individual schools may be particularly beneficial. This may be especially true with regard to the data elements of the framework.

Lack of participation of PS/RtI Coaches as well as additional feedback solicited through participants' comments suggested that assessment of whether each school has the personnel resources necessary to implement the PS/RtI framework at their school is essential. Comments also provided insights concerning the roles of administrative support, communication, implementation, training, and replication of effective practices. These results are discussed and recommendations are offered.

PROBLEM SOLVING / RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (PS/RTI) EVALUATION: PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEM SOLVING / RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION SKILLS SURVEY RESULTS

The goal of this report is to assist in efforts to evaluate implementation of the PS/RtI framework in Pinellas County Schools. In accord with this goal, results of the Perceptions of PS/RtI Skills Survey administered in the Spring of 2011 are presented and compared to results obtained in 2010. Comments submitted by respondents to this survey are also examined. Recommendations are offered based upon the quantitative and qualitative information derived from this survey to assist district and school leaders in the continued development and evaluation of the PS/RtI framework.

METHOD

The Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey was administered districtwide. The Perceptions scale contains three factors that assess individuals' perceptions of RtI skills when addressing Academic issues (25 items), perceptions of RtI skills when addressing behavior issues (20 items) and perceptions of skills in accessing, interpreting, and graphing data (12 items). Means were computed for each of these scales for all participants who had no more than 20% of data missing on each scale.

Participants indicated their job classification, school, training participation, and SBLT member status. Perceptions scale data were examined based upon responses to each of these questions. Data were also compared to that obtained in 2010 to determine in any changes had occurred in mean perceptions of skills.

Comments were solicited from participants by asking "What additional supports, if any, may help you to implement PS/RtI effectively for students at your school? If a/any support(s) has/have been particularly useful, please also let us know. Thank you very much". Themes from comments are presented and discussed with examples.

RESULTS

SCALE MEANS OVERALL AND BY JOB CLASSIFICATION

Results presented below compare means on the Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation scales by Job Classification and overall between 2010 and 2011 administrations of the PS/Rtl Perceptions scale.

	Academic Mean		Behavioral Mean		Data Manipulation Mean		N	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
School Administrator* Principal	3.81	3.90	3.80	3.79	3.42	3.46	72	34
AP		3.62		3.59		3.26		33
Teacher-General Education	3.43	3.48	3.17	3.32	2.93	3.04	351	80
Teacher-ESE	3.51	3.31	3.33	3.25	2.90	2.69	123	24
ESE-Other	2.91	2.76	3.12	2.96	2.79	2.84	45	15
Instructional-Non Classroom	3.45	3.30	3.37	2.87	3.07	3.26	59	6
Counselor	3.25	3.31	3.40	3.48	2.80	2.95	78	48
Psychological Services	4.09	3.74	3.95	3.81	3.82	3.72	55	26
School Social Worker	2.69	2.88	3.53	3.91	3.33	3.52	35	29
Speech Therapist	3.05	2.70	2.64	2.44	2.45	2.28	18	22
Reading/Math Coach	4.16	3.18	3.26	2.55	3.32	2.92	40	2
PS/Rtl Coach	3.86	3.40	3.77	3.32	3.35	3.17	8	2
Occupational/Physical Therapist		2.29		2.38		1.90		8
Media Specialist		2.91		3.09		2.88		5
Total	3.47	3.34	3.33	3.39	3.04	3.08	884	334

*School Administrator was replaced by separate categories for Principal and Assistance Principal for 2011

- Caution is necessary when making inferences about skill levels districtwide based upon a sample of 334 individuals. Many schools had less than five individuals complete the Perceptions scale.
- Participation by 2 PS/Rtl Coaches did not permit assessment of the perceived skills of members of this group.
- The total means across job classifications are very similar in 2011 compared to 2010. We cannot infer that skills have either increased or declined district-wide based upon these results.
- Skill levels were also very similar from 2010 to 2011 across job classifications.
- Psychological Services employees and Administrators indicated the strongest skill levels, while reported skill levels across other classifications indicated that others “have this skill but still need some support to use it”.

- Social Workers indicated a higher perceived Behavioral skill level in 2011 (3.91) than they did in 2010 (3.53). This represented the only substantial difference from 2010 to 2011 among a group with a sufficient sample size. Self-reports also increased to a lesser degree in the Academic and Data Manipulation domains for this group. Training conducted during the 2010-2011 school year may have affected the perceived skills of School Social Workers.

SCALE MEANS BY SBLT MEMBERSHIP

Results presented below compare Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation means based upon whether the respondent was a member of a School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT).

		Academic PS/Rtl Skills		Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills		Data Manipulation Skills		N	
		2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
SBLT Member	No	3.33	3.10	3.15	3.00	2.85	2.71	506	138
	Yes	3.63	3.51	3.55	3.66	3.28	3.33	392	196
	Total	3.46	3.34	3.32	3.39	3.04	3.08	898	334

- Results based upon SBLT membership were similar in 2011 compared to 2010.
- SBLT members rated their perceived skills higher than did non SBLT members during both years.
- While non-SBLT members' means are slightly lower across domains in 2011 compared to 2010, these differences are not large enough to be significant from an applied standpoint.

TRAINING

MEAN TRAINING TYPES ATTENDED

Results presented below indicate the mean number of training types attended (out of a possible total of 6) across job classifications.

	Mean Training Types Attended	
	Mean	N
Principal	3.12	34
Assistant Principal	2.55	33
Teacher - General Education	2.30	80
Teacher - ESE	1.67	24
ESE - Other	1.73	15
Instructional - Non-Classroom	1.83	6
School Counselor	3.27	48
Psychological Services	4.15	26
School Social Worker	2.79	29
Occupational/Physical Therapist	1.25	8
Speech Therapist	1.95	22
Reading/Literacy Coach	3.00	2
Media Specialist	1.80	5
PS/RtI Coach	5.00	2
Total	2.62	334

- Consistent with their role as leaders in the PS/RtI framework, Psychological Services employees (4.15) and Administrators (3.12 and 2.55) reported among the highest mean number of training types attended.
- School Counselors (3.27) reported the second highest mean number of training types attended. Despite training attendance, the self-reported perceived skills of this group were lower than that of Psychological Services employees and Administrators. Their mean ratings are also only slightly higher in 2011 than they were in 2010. Taken together, a significant positive effect of training for this group cannot be inferred.

TRAINING PARTICIPATION BY JOB CLASSIFICATION

Results presented below indicate participation in the six different types of training across job classifications.

Table 4: Training Participation across Job Classifications-2011								
			Participated in District SBLT Training	PS/RTI Training delivered through school based PLC's	PS/RTI Presentation at Faculty Meetings	State PS/Rtl online Moodle course	Training on Moodle	Other trainings on PS/Rtl
Principal	Yes	N	33	25	27	5	5	11
		%	97.1%	73.5%	79.4%	14.7%	14.7%	32.4%
	No	N	1	9	7	29	29	23
		%	2.9%	26.5%	20.6%	85.3%	85.3%	67.6%
Assistant Principal	Yes	N	25	22	23	1	3	10
		%	75.8%	66.7%	69.7%	3.0%	9.1%	30.3%
	No	N	8	11	10	32	30	23
		%	24.2%	33.3%	30.3%	97.0%	90.9%	69.7%
Teacher - General Education	Yes	N	24	64	55	10	16	15
		%	30.0%	80.0%	68.8%	12.5%	20.0%	18.8%
	No	N	56	16	25	70	64	65
		%	70.0%	20.0%	31.2%	87.5%	80.0%	81.2%
Teacher - ESE	Yes	N	5	14	15	1	3	2
		%	20.8%	58.3%	62.5%	4.2%	12.5%	8.3%
	No	N	19	10	9	23	21	22
		%	79.2%	41.7%	37.5%	95.8%	87.5%	91.7%
ESE - Other	Yes	N	6	5	7	2	4	2
		%	40.0%	33.3%	46.7%	13.3%	26.7%	13.3%
	No	N	9	10	8	13	11	13
		%	60.0%	66.7%	53.3%	86.7%	73.3%	86.7%
Instructional - Non-Classroom	Yes	N	3	3	2	1	2	0
		%	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%
	No	N	3	3	4	5	4	6
		%	50.0%	50.0%	66.7%	83.3%	66.7%	100.0%
School Counselor	Yes	N	40	25	35	18	19	20
		%	83.3%	52.1%	72.9%	37.5%	39.6%	41.7%
	No	N	8	23	13	30	29	28
		%	16.7%	47.9%	27.1%	62.5%	60.4%	58.3%

Psychological Services	Yes	N	25	11	13	21	15	23
		%	96.2%	42.3%	50.0%	80.8%	57.7%	88.5%
	No	N	1	15	13	5	11	3
		%	3.8%	57.7%	50.0%	19.2%	42.3%	11.5%
School Social Worker	Yes	N	29	9	12	8	10	13
		%	100.0%	31.0%	41.4%	27.6%	34.5%	44.8%
	No	N	0	20	17	21	19	16
		%	0.0%	69.0%	58.6%	72.4%	65.5%	55.2%
Occupational/Physical Therapist	Yes	N	1	1	4	1	0	3
		%	12.5%	12.5%	50.0%	12.5%	0.0%	37.5%
	No	N	7	7	4	7	8	5
		%	87.5%	87.5%	50.0%	87.5%	100.0%	62.5%
Speech Therapist	Yes	N	6	9	13	1	2	12
		%	27.3%	40.9%	59.1%	4.5%	9.1%	54.5%
	No	N	16	13	9	21	20	10
		%	72.7%	59.1%	40.9%	95.5%	90.9%	45.5%
Reading/Literacy Coach	Yes	N	2	2	2	0	0	0
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	No	N	0	0	0	2	2	2
		%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Media Specialist	Yes	N	0	5	3	0	0	1
		%	0.0%	100.0%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	No	N	5	0	2	5	5	4
		%	100.0%	0.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%
PS/Rtl Coach	Yes	N	2	2	2	1	2	1
		%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%
	No	N	0	0	0	1	0	1
		%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Total	Yes	N	201	197	213	70	81	113
		%	60.2%	59.0%	63.8%	21.0%	24.3%	33.8%
	No	N	133	137	121	264	253	221
		%	39.8%	41.0%	36.2%	79.0%	75.7%	66.2%

- Results indicate that Psychological Services employees were more likely than School Counselors and School Social Workers to participate in online Moodle training and “Other” forms of training.
- These results suggest that the higher level of perceived skill among Psychological Services employees may be due to participation in more intensive forms of training.
- Despite lower participation in Moodle training among Principals and Assistant Principals, their perceived skills were among the highest of all groups. District SBLT training combined

with continued involvement in the process from an administrative standpoint may be enough for this group to report higher perceived skills. However, increased participation in Moodle training may further increase the perceived skills of administrators.

- Overall, results indicate that any form of training is likely enough to allow employees to state that they have skill but need support to use it, while more intensive training via Moodle is likely necessary to elevate skill levels to the point where individuals believe that they “can use this skill with little support”.

PERCEIVED SKILL BY TRAINING FOR GENERAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Results presented below examine the perceived skills of General Education teachers as a function of the number of training types attended. This was the only group with an N large enough to conduct this analysis. Even for this group, a larger N would have been beneficial, but the trend of the results did provide some insight concerning the relationship between training and perceived skill. Results are presented separately below for SBLT and non-SBLT members to remove the potential confound that could occur if higher skilled SBLT members were also more likely to attend more training.

			Total Training Types Attended						
SBLT Member			0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	Academic	Mean	.	.	3.91	3.74	4.84	.	.
		N	0	0	4	8	2	0	0
	Behavior	Mean	.	.	3.55	3.63	4.48	.	.
		N	0	0	4	8	2	0	0
	Data	Mean	.	.	3.00	3.29	4.62	.	.
		N	0	0	4	8	2	0	0
No	Academic	Mean	2.08	3.08	3.32	3.71	3.94	3.61	4.86
		N	1	24	20	11	5	3	2
	Behavior	Mean	2.20	2.91	3.09	3.66	3.87	3.26	4.92
		N	1	24	20	11	5	3	2
	Data	Mean	2.00	2.58	2.93	3.27	3.55	3.28	4.83
		N	1	24	20	11	5	3	2

- Results of this analysis support the view that only one training is necessary for teachers to report that they “have this skill but still need support to use it”, while more intensive multiple trainings are necessary for individuals to report that they “can use this skill with little support”.

COMMENTS

Respondents (N=90) submitted comments concerning their experience with PS/RtI. District administrators are encouraged to review all comments. Main themes from these comments are summarized below.

PERSONNEL RESOURCES

Several comments cited the personnel resources necessary to implement PS/RtI effectively. Especially at a time when personnel resources may be declining across schools, comments suggest that it is necessary to examine whether each school has the personnel resources necessary to accomplish their goals with respect to PS/RtI. If the personnel resources are not sufficient, then both the district and individual schools may need to adjust goals so that they can be accomplished with the personnel resources provided.

The key is time. For interventions and tracking of interventions to take place effectively, time is needed to make sure this is done the right way. I often see that secondary teachers have very little "extra" time to implement academic and/or behavioral interventions effectively, if at all. Plus, with less staff to help with data collection and/or interventions this only further impedes the process and it looks as if next year will be worse. I feel overwhelmed with the RtI process, as I try my best to do a thorough job. However, when there are too many needing Tier interventions that becomes very difficult to do. PCS starts out supporting an initiative, but when it comes to \$\$ often those critical and supportive positions are the first to be looked at for reduction (guidance, reading coach, student services, etc.).

The most useful resource we had for RtI implementation was our RtI Coach and her assistant in the 2009-2010 school year. This year we lost those positions. We have a part time Title 1 facilitator this year 2010-2011 that has been helpful in organizing our tier 2 data/groups. We lose that position next year. We are absolutely scrambling to find support/resource personnel to keep this process alive. Our Psychologist is wonderfully helpful. We have lost him 2 days a week now. Our Social Worker has been given an extra school this year, so diminished support there. We have been doing ongoing small group training with our teachers, but they need district training to see the big picture impact of RtI. They are so overloaded that they still are not embracing this process as a way of work. I am now looking at my role as Tier 3 Coordinator being divided between two schools--pending School Board action. I firmly believe RtI is what is best for children. My dream is to have the resources to make RtI work for each child in my school. Despite our hard work and valiant efforts, we are not there yet. Any help would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

First of all an RTi coach is really needed to do the RTi process and be effective. Having an assistant principal and/or guidance counselor complete these task is not done as effectively or efficiently as needed to really make a difference. The trainings are helpful, but a coach is very much in need. As for the leaders of the RTi in the building, the psychologist and social worker are key players and should be more of the leaders of the process involving the administration too. RTi has merit, but needs to be done with more than the administration, and psychologist and social worker.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

A second theme highlighted the necessity of administrative support. Comments suggested that strong administrative support is necessary to implement the PS/RtI framework effectively. Future evaluation activity should continue to monitor the level of administrative support for the PS/RtI framework at each school.

I put "highly skilled" for many items because I know how to do it, but I cannot necessarily "ensure" that it is done correctly without administrative support. I have worked at schools with a high level of administrative support with PS/RTI and I have worked at schools with hardly any administrative support. The key to ensuring that PS/RTI is implemented with fidelity is to have an administrative team that understands the philosophy and uses their leadership to ensure that all school employees are following through with plans.

Teachers at my school still do not know what RTI is. Must have full and complete administrative support for our SBLT to for RTI to be correctly implemented. Our SBLT has made positive gains but we do not follow through with good ideas or collect data to show what interventions we are providing.

Administrators need to become stake holders in this process, without them there is no PS/RtI. This cannot be a bottom up approach, it has to be top down as a collaborative effort. At present my hypothesis is that to many administrators this is simply doing business as usual with a few FBAs thrown in here and there; not because this is how to solve a problem but as a means create an acceptable paper trail. RtI meetings are simply reconfigured Student Study meetings where individual students are discussed and referred for consultation/counseling, etc. There is no system (Tier 1) or tier 2 for that matter, interventions/discussions going on. The items left blank were because I do not have the authority to "ensure" anything. I can check on the fidelity of interventions and report it, but I cannot ensure interventions are being implemented.

COMMUNICATION

Comments stated that information must be easily accessible and flow quickly for PS/RtI to be effective. Comments emphasized that each school must ensure that the necessary data and intervention information reaches all personnel quickly and that a clear system is set up to do so.

Most of the data regarding behavior teachers do not have available to them

Results of areas to target, interventions, and follow up need to be reported to the staff more regularly.

As in most events, a team that works together closely has the best chance of success. While the individuals in our RtI team all do their parts effectively, there is a lack of communication between the team members that allows for somewhat of a break down. Many general education teachers in our school do not know what all a speech language pathologist does. Many other team members do not fully understand what the kids do when they go to reading lab, VE classrooms, language therapy, etc. If we had better consistency and communication between all of the RtI team members, it would better ensure that no child fell through the cracks, that all interventions were done appropriately and correctly, and that all data was

collected in the correct way. Having a collective system in place would allow the process to move faster for those students who are not responding, instead of having to correct mistakes, etc.

More communication with RTI Team members and all teachers of the students who are being discussed and the salient concerns. My grade level administrator fails to communicate with me re student interventions being implemented.

We need to structure our RTI meetings to include teachers. Presently, we meet when teachers are teaching classes. We need to plan times to meet when teachers are available.

Do not have ability to access behavioral information on students on case load without asking someone to give that information to me. I thought we were to have access to any behavioral information of those students on our case management. Information regarding behavior can be helpful: number of referrals a student has over a grading period, bus referrals, administrative referrals vs behavior specialist referrals, etc. When it can be accessed only by asking someone else to give it to you it is generally useless as generally you never get it or get it too late which renders it useless when trying to choose an intervention.

IMPLEMENTATION

Comments suggest that implementation of the PS/RTI framework is a work in progress. Comments suggest that school personnel must be aware of each person's role in the process as well as the construction of the overall framework. Then, once the framework is clear to all, the effective implementation of its' component parts must be examined.

Any information I have was derived from experiences prior to working here. I have no actual knowledge of PS/RTI as it pertains to this campus and its initiatives. I had to respond NS for the following because I am completely unaware of the processes/tools for tier 2/3 interventions on this campus:

"Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for academics. Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for behavior."

Even tier one behavior stamps and cards were never explained and I have been unable to provide students with any details on where/how/when to redeem or what the reward might be or where to receive new cards.

Guidance counselors (who act as intervention coordinator) need stronger training in PS/RTI and all that is required to implement. I worked with a brand new guidance counselor this year who received no training in what paperwork was required, which consent forms to provide, who is required to attend certain meetings, etc.... I know there is a handbook for SBLT's, but can there be an Intervention Coordinator handbook?

I am not sure if our site does fidelity checks, but I think it would be a good idea to ensure that the interventions in the plans are carried out appropriately. Also, we need to develop a more seamless system for data collection- what types of data to use with each intervention, ensuring that the data used is an actual reflection of the skills practiced in the interventions, etc.

It would be very helpful to have a Tier 1 social skills program to teach these behaviors throughout the school. There is a lot of inconsistency between teachers. Classroom management is a problem. Need a lot more support with this.

First, allow me to say I am a first year SW for PCS. It appears that many teachers are not strongly familiar with the RtI process and are not clear on the processes for RtI. Feedback from teachers indicate they are not really sure of what the SBLT is nor the work being done by SBLT. Interestingly, it also seems that the SBLT may also not be 100% sure of their role in the whole RtI process. I find this to be the case when discussions centers around who decides whether the student needs an intervention change and how that change will occur.

School staff are not all aware of RtI and are not always supported and/or observed for intervention fidelity. Therefore, there is still much confusion. Some teaching staff do not understand the need for tracking behaviors, trying a variety of interventions, and working in conjunction with SBLT members. Without school buy-in, RtI has a limited chance of full integration and therefore, success.

TRAINING

Comments concerning training focused mainly upon a need for more training in graphing and displaying data, as well as more hands-on training at the school level as schools work to apply the training that they have received to creating a PS/RtI framework at their individual school.

Additional supports:

Any guidance on funds allocation (or other creative ideas) for intervention resources, particularly Tier 3 for academics at the high school.

How to facilitate subject-wide problem solving at teacher PLCs- use of classroom-based data to measure effectiveness of core instruction.

I think it would be helpful to dedicate more time at the SBLT Trainings to using our own school's data and working it through examples; the powerpoints are effective in teaching the skills, but the relevance in using them when we get back to school is sometimes "watered down" by that point. I feel that less explicit instruction and more guided practice would be helpful for my teams.

Graphing and displaying school and student data

REPLICATION

Comments suggested that a useful means of fostering development of the PS/RtI framework at each school involves sharing information concerning successes achieved at other schools. These comments supported stronger communication concerning replication of successful PS/RtI framework activities across schools.

Suggestions to team members of what supports have been utilized at other school sites.

Examples of how interventions have worked at other school sites.

Synopsis of how the SBLT has shown successes with providing interventions and processes at other school sites.

National examples of how RTI has been implemented with successes evident.

The processes are still too undefined in my opinion. We are all trying to figure out what other schools are doing trying to get to what we need to do for our schools.

SCHOOL-LEVEL MEANS

Results below present means across the three Perceptions subscales by school. Data are not presented separately by job classification to protect the anonymity of respondents at individual schools. Responses by those working at multiple schools are included at the end of the table.

Table 6: School-level Means across Perceptions subscales				
	Academic Mean	Behavior Mean	Data Manipulation Mean	Total N
74th Street Elementary	4.30	3.82	4.71	2
Anona Elementary	3.60	4.00	3.42	1
Azalea Elementary	3.71	3.70	3.72	3
Azalea Middle School	2.74	3.20	3.62	2
Bardmoor Elementary	3.92	3.65	3.04	2
Bauder Elementary	2.88	2.75	2.25	1
Bay Point Elementary	3.68	3.75	3.88	2
Bay Point Middle School	3.59	3.47	3.21	11
Bay Vista Fundamental Elementary	3.20	3.00	2.96	2
Bayside High School	3.21	3.33	3.19	3
Bear Creek Elementary	.	.	.	0
Belcher Elementary	2.59	2.98	3.11	3
Belleair Elementary	3.16	4.85	4.42	1
Blanton Elementary	.	.	.	0
Boca Ciega High School	3.56	3.59	3.18	10
Brooker Creek Elementary	3.59	3.90	2.75	2
Calvin Hunsinger	3.41	3.73	3.36	3
Campbell Park Elementary	2.94	2.65	3.21	2
Carwise Middle School	3.63	3.85	3.67	3
Clearwater High School	.	.	.	0
Clearwater Fundamental	4.14	3.82	3.17	2
Clearwater Intermediate	.	.	.	0
Countryside High School	4.11	4.18	4.00	3
Cross Bayou Elementary	2.92	3.80	2.42	1
Curlew Creek Elementary	3.40	3.30	3.33	1
Curtis Fundamental	3.00	2.65	2.25	1
Cypress Woods Elementary	3.99	3.23	2.89	3

Dixie Hollins High School	2.75	2.70	2.76	3
Dropout Prevention (Includes DJJ)	.	.	.	0
Dunedin High School	.	.	.	0
Dunedin Elementary	.	.	.	0
Dunedin Middle School	.	.	.	0
East Lake High School	.	.	.	0
Eisenhower Elementary	3.76	3.65	3.25	1
Fairmount Park Elementary	2.71	3.52	2.71	2
Fitzgerald Middle School	.	.	.	0
Forest Lakes Elementary	3.31	3.24	3.02	4
Frontier Elementary	3.60	4.05	3.08	1
Fuguitt Elementary	1.56	2.32	2.75	2
Garrison-Jones Elementary	3.64	3.53	3.33	3
Gibbs High School	3.44	3.88	3.18	2
Gulfport Elementary	4.41	4.50	3.96	2
Hamilton Disston	3.28	4.00	3.83	1
High Point Elementary	3.92	4.95	3.58	1
Highland Lakes Elementary	.	.	.	0
Hopkins Middle School	3.92	4.90	4.42	1
Hospital Homebound	.	.	.	0
Jamerson Elementary	3.68	3.42	3.35	3
Lake St. George Elementary	3.67	3.25	3.00	3
Lakeview Fundamental	3.12	3.05	3.21	2
Lakewood High School	3.12	3.40	3.25	1
Lakewood Elementary	2.84	3.35	2.71	2
Largo High School	3.88	4.15	3.75	1
Largo Middle School	3.32	3.26	2.86	19
Lealman Elementary	4.84	4.05	4.27	1
Lealman Intermediate	2.75	2.70	2.36	3
Leila Davis Elementary	.	.	.	0
Lynch Elementary	3.92	3.90	3.50	1
Madeira Beach Fundamental	4.28	4.30	3.75	1
Maximo Elementary	.	.	.	0
McMullen-Booth Elementary	2.74	2.85	2.26	2
Meadowlawn Middle School	3.44	3.88	3.33	2
Melrose Elementary	3.52	4.05	4.42	1
Mildred Helms Elementary	2.33	2.58	2.42	3
Mount Vernon Elementary	.	.	.	0
New Heights Elementary	.	.	.	0
Nina Harris	2.58	2.67	2.25	5
North Shore Elementary	1.90	3.02	2.29	2

Northeast High School	3.50	3.40	3.33	1
Northwest Elementary	4.42	3.65	4.00	2
Oak Grove Middle School	3.39	3.43	2.78	3
Oakhurst Elementary	2.92	2.90	2.92	1
Oldsmar Elementary	3.56	2.94	2.58	12
Orange Grove Elementary	.	.	.	0
Osceola High School	.	.	.	0
Osceola Middle School	.	.	.	0
Ozona Elementary	.	.	.	0
PTEC Clearwater	.	.	.	0
PTEC St. Petersburg	2.96	3.03	2.42	2
Palm Harbor Middle School	3.80	3.53	4.00	2
Palm Harbor University	.	.	.	0
Pasadena Fundamental	4.24	4.20	4.33	1
Paul B. Stephens	2.83	2.98	2.71	22
Perkins Elementary	3.99	3.78	3.34	2
Pinellas Central Elementary	3.94	4.35	3.83	2
Pinellas Park High School	.	.	.	0
Pinellas Park Elementary	3.81	4.53	3.38	2
Pinellas Park Middle School	3.72	3.80	2.50	1
Pinellas Secondary	3.24	3.95	3.33	1
Plumb Elementary	3.68	3.65	3.33	1
Ponce de Leon Elementary	.	.	.	0
Rawlings Elementary	.	.	.	0
Richard Sanders	3.58	4.16	3.58	4
Ridgecrest Elementary	.	.	.	0
Safety Harbor Elementary	.	.	.	0
Safety Harbor Middle School	.	.	.	0
San Jose Elementary	4.32	4.25	4.00	2
Sanderlin Elementary	.	.	.	0
Sandy Lane Elementary	1.09	1.05	1.00	1
Sawgrass Lake Elementary	3.34	3.15	2.92	3
Seminole High School	4.20	4.25	4.00	1
Seminole Elementary	.	.	.	0
Seminole Middle School	2.95	2.96	2.75	4
Sexton Elementary	2.59	2.48	1.94	4
Shore Acres Elementary	3.38	3.38	2.92	2
Skycrest Elementary	3.68	3.30	2.58	1
Skyview Elementary	3.42	2.75	2.42	2
Southern Oak Elementary	.	.	.	0
St. Petersburg High School	2.72	2.35	1.50	1

Starkey Elementary	3.00	2.50	2.42	1
Sunset Hills Elementary	3.99	4.08	3.08	3
Sutherland Elementary	.	.	.	0
Tarpon Fundamental	3.36	3.50	3.75	1
Tarpon Springs High School	.	.	.	0
Tarpon Springs Elementary	.	.	.	0
Tarpon Springs Middle School	3.58	3.68	2.98	22
Thurgood Marshall Fundamental	.	.	.	0
Tyrone Middle School	3.48	3.37	3.23	21
Walsingham Elementary	3.13	2.92	2.87	5
Westgate Elementary	3.35	2.93	2.88	12
Woodlawn Elementary	.	.	.	0
Multiple Schools	3.25	3.56	3.30	50
Total	3.34	3.39	3.08	334

- 8 schools had more than 5 individuals responding to the Perceptions survey
- These 8 schools may have stronger buy-in or administrative leadership supporting the development of their PS/RtI framework.
- Future evaluation activity may limit administration of the Perceptions survey to schools who wish to use it to continuously monitor employees' perceptions of their skills.

CONCLUSIONS

The response rate for the Perceptions survey was low across schools. Only 8 schools had 10 or more individuals participating. Low response rates limit the ability of schools to gauge perceptions of skills schoolwide with respect to the PS/RtI framework. Only 2 PS/RtI Coaches participated, which limits the ability to examine the perceived skill level of these employees.

Data provided across job classifications was similar to data from the 2010 administration of the Perceptions survey. Psychological Services employees and Administrators reported the highest skill levels while teachers report having skills related to PS/RtI but still need help to use them. School Social Workers' scores across domains suggested a possible increase in skill level from 2010 to 2011. Differences in skill levels between SBLT and non-SBLT team members were similar in 2010 and 2011, with SBLT members reporting higher scores during both administrations.

Training attendance reports indicated that Psychological Services employees are more likely to attend Moodle training. Participation in more advanced Moodle training may be associated in part with the higher skill levels reported by Psychological Services personnel. Analysis of teachers' training participation suggested that participation in any form of training is enough to report "having this skill but needing support to use it". However, higher levels of proficiency likely require participation in Moodle training at a minimum.

Submission of comments provided insights concerning the role of personnel resources, administrative support, communication, implementation, training, and replication of the PS/RtI framework. Comments highlighted the necessity of ensuring that the personnel resources at each school match the demands of the PS/RtI framework. Comments highlighted the necessity of strong

administrative support to facilitate development and implementation of the PS/RtI framework at each school. Comments highlighted the need to develop systems to ensure that communication flows efficiently among all school personnel concerning the data and intervention components of the PS/RtI framework. Comments indicated that effective implementation requires both a clear understanding of the components of the PS/RtI framework at each school as well as checks to assure that components are being delivered with fidelity. Comments highlighted the importance of hands-on training in which individual schools are assisted in their application of the PS/RtI framework. Particular help may be necessary with regard to the data components of the framework. Comments suggested that replication and communication of what has been effective across schools will be necessary as the PS/RtI framework in Pinellas expands.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Going forward, the Perceptions survey should be administered at schools and among populations (i.e. Psychological Services) who wish to use it as an assessment tool. Districtwide data among those who chose to participate were highly similar in 2010 and 2011. Without much higher participation rates, the utility of these data to SBLTs at individual schools will be negligible.

A population of particular interest when this survey was administered was the PS/RtI Coaches. Last year's data indicated the perceived skill level of the 8 Coaches surveyed was below what was expected. This year, only 2 PS/RtI Coaches participated. If PS/RtI Coaches are in fact assisting schools with development and implementation of the PS/RtI framework then their perceived skill level should be assessed. If the PS/RtI Coaches are not assisting in the development and implementation of the PS/RtI framework then knowledge of who is doing so at each school is necessary.

The role of PS/RtI Coaches is associated with a primary concern expressed in the comments provided by participants regarding whether the personnel resources at each school match the demands of the framework. This is a particularly salient concern if those currently providing support for the PS/RtI framework are cut this year due to budgetary issues. So a primary goal going forward is to examine whether each school has the personnel necessary to implement the framework and whether this will be case following any budget cuts.

Data suggest that PLC-based training, and that provided via faculty meetings and district SBLT training provide a good foundation to familiarize individuals with the PS/RtI framework and place them in a position where they believe they "have skill but need help to use it". However, more specialized, hands-on training may be necessary at each school to help them build the framework and processes specific to their school. Assistance with the data elements of the process at each school would likely be particularly beneficial. Once the framework is set up at each school then individual teachers and other personnel may engage in additional advanced trainings to build upon their skill sets.

Additional feedback concerning administrative support, communication, implementation, and replication issues should be reviewed by district leaders who have been working directly with schools to determine the applicability of these comments to efforts to improve development of the PS/RtI framework districtwide. Overall, these comments speak to the need to clarify the component parts of the framework so that the data, process, and intervention elements are clear to everyone schoolwide within each school.