

Evaluation of Problem-Solving / Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) Survey Results

Research & Accountability
Pinellas County Schools

2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	3
Method	3
Participants.....	3
Validity.....	3
Demographics.....	4
Surveys.....	4
Shared Beliefs Survey	4
Perception of Skills Survey.....	5
PS/RtI Beliefs Survey	5
Tiers I and II Observation Checklist.....	5
Results	5
Job Classification	5
Job Classification by Shared Beliefs	5
Job Classification by Perception of PS/RtI Skills.....	6
Job Classification by mean PS/RtI Beliefs	7
School-Based Leadership Team.....	9
Experience	10
Training	10
School Level.....	12
School-Level Survey Results	13
Conclusions	18
Positive Bias.....	18
Team Approach	18
Reported Skill of PS/RtI coaches.....	19
Training	19
School Level.....	19
Student Academic Ability.....	19
Effectiveness.....	20
School-Based Processes	20
Recommendations	21
Attachments	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of this evaluation was to examine perceptions of PCS staff with regard to their own skills implementing PS/RtI practices as well as their beliefs regarding PS/RtI. Employees across several job classifications were asked to rate their perception of their Academic PS/RtI, Behavioral PS/RtI, and Data Manipulation skills. Respondents were also asked to state their level of agreement with the role of Instruction and Data-Based Decision Making in the PS/RtI framework as well as their perceptions of Student Academic Ability of students with disabilities to achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math.

Results were likely skewed toward a positive bias throughout this evaluation as a minority of staff completed the survey and many who began completing the survey discontinued participation. Those who completed the survey likely do not represent a random sample of employees. They may represent those who are most invested in the PS/RtI framework or are most willing to commit their time to survey completion.

Although methodological concerns exist, results suggested that specialists in psychological services, school social work, and reading/math coaches are confident in their PS/RtI skills, while teachers are confident in their ability to implement PS/RtI when provided with sufficient support to do so. This combination suggests that, on average, school-based teams will be able to implement PS/RtI when working collaboratively. While the sample of PS/RtI coaches included in this evaluation was small, those who completed surveys rated their skills as being sufficient to implement PS/RtI if they are provided with sufficient support. As this group is tasked with guiding the PS/RtI framework, one would expect that their self-report of PS/RtI skills would be much higher.

This evaluation was also intended to examine PS/RtI implementation at the school-based level across PCS. However, response rates for both the survey and observation components of this evaluation were insufficient to provide a reliable school-based assessment of PS/RtI implementation. While results were not reliable for individual schools, data did suggest that staff agreement with PS/RtI instructional philosophy and data-based decision making declines as students advance through their schooling. A plausible potential explanation for these findings may be that students who exhibit difficulties at later stages of their schooling are perceived as less likely to benefit from PS/RtI intervention strategies.

Perhaps the most significant finding of this evaluation concerned employee confidence in the potential effectiveness of the PS/RtI framework in terms of outcomes. When asked whether students with high incidence disabilities who are receiving exceptional student education services can achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math, the average staff rating was just above “neutral”. For the 2008-2009 school year, less than 40% of students in each high-incidence disability group within PCS achieved grade-level benchmarks in reading and math¹.

Results of the present evaluation suggest that exceptional efforts to provide training and educate staff in PS/RtI have yielded positive results. While further efforts are necessary, data suggest that the district is moving in the right direction in terms of process and training. Ultimately, the success and sustainability of the PS/RtI framework will depend upon outcomes. Currently, data suggest that employees are uncertain whether PS/RtI will result in positive outcomes. Continued efforts to employ effective content, streamline process, and monitor outcomes may yield positive results in the years ahead. Specific recommendations are discussed at the conclusion of this evaluation.

¹ percent of students achieving benchmarks for PCS grades 3-10: SLD Reading = 24%; SLD Math = 30%; EBD Reading = 28%; EBD Math = 29%; OHI Reading = 38%; OHI Math = 36%

EVALUATION OF PROBLEM-SOLVING / RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION (PS/RTI) SURVEY RESULTS

Response to Intervention is defined as the change in behavior or performance as a function of an intervention². The basic elements of PS/RtI are required by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). As such, PS/RtI practices have become a central component of efforts to meet Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in Florida schools. Pinellas County schools have begun to implement PS/RtI practices district-wide. Implementation has been supported through training and dissemination of information concerning effective PS/RtI practices. The present evaluation has two primary goals. The first is to examine employees' perceptions of their skills associated with implementation of PS/RtI. The second is to examine employees' beliefs regarding the fundamental tenets of PS/RtI. Results of this evaluation are intended to inform the district's ongoing training and implementation efforts.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

All district personnel engaged in the PS/RtI framework were asked via district email to complete the three evaluation surveys using an internet-based survey program. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate their general job description within PCS. Results presented in Table 1 indicate response rates for employees who began the process of completing the surveys. The Shared Beliefs Survey was administered first, followed by the Perception of Skills Survey and the PS/RtI Beliefs Survey. Results indicate that a majority of respondents completed the short Shared Beliefs Survey (83.5% overall). However, results indicate that participation dropped considerably as respondents encountered the lengthier Perception of Skills and PS/RtI Beliefs Surveys. Overall, 50% of respondents completed the Perception of Skills Survey and 39% of respondents completed the PS/RtI Beliefs Survey.

VALIDITY

This pattern of survey completion strongly suggests that results must be interpreted with caution. It may be the case that responses were obtained only from those employees who were either personally invested strongly enough in PS/RtI or were generous enough with their time to complete the Perception of Skills and PS/RtI Beliefs surveys, in particular. It is also important to note that these data only include employees who began the survey. The subset of employees who did not complete any portion of the survey may be less personally invested in PS/RtI or generous with their time than those who completed a portion of the survey. Therefore, examination of response rates in this section suggests that this is a restricted sample. As such, results may provide inflated estimates of employees' perception of skills and beliefs across job classifications.

² Gresham, F.M. (1991) Conceptualizing behavior disorders in term of resistance to intervention. *School Psychology Review*, 20, 23-36.

Table 1: Response Rate by Job Classification

	Shared Beliefs Survey				Perception of Skills Survey				PS/Rtl Beliefs Survey				Total N
	Completed		Not Completed		Completed		Not Completed		Completed		Not Completed		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
School Administrator	96	79.3%	25	20.7%	72	59.5%	49	40.5%	58	47.9%	63	52.1%	121
Teacher-General Education	673	82.5%	143	17.5%	351	43.0%	465	57.0%	269	33.0%	547	67.0%	816
Teacher-ESE	202	86.3%	32	13.7%	123	52.6%	111	47.4%	92	39.3%	142	60.7%	234
ESE-Other	74	82.2%	16	17.8%	45	50.0%	45	50.0%	38	42.2%	52	57.8%	90
Instructional-Non Classroom	101	80.2%	25	19.8%	59	46.8%	67	53.2%	45	35.7%	81	64.3%	126
Counselor	122	87.8%	17	12.2%	78	56.1%	61	43.9%	57	41.0%	82	59.0%	139
Psychological Services	62	92.5%	5	7.5%	55	82.1%	12	17.9%	50	74.6%	17	25.4%	67
School Social Worker	49	87.5%	7	12.5%	35	62.5%	21	37.5%	31	55.4%	25	44.6%	56
Speech Therapist	26	78.8%	7	21.2%	18	54.5%	15	45.5%	13	39.4%	20	60.6%	33
Reading/Math Coach	58	82.9%	12	17.1%	40	57.1%	30	42.9%	30	42.9%	40	57.1%	70
PS/Rtl Coach	13	81.2%	3	18.8%	8	50.0%	8	50.0%	7	43.8%	9	56.2%	16
Total	1476	83.5%	292	16.5%	884	50.0%	884	50.0%	690	39.0%	1078	61.0%	1768

DEMOGRAPHICS

In addition to Job Classification, the survey began with questions concerning employees’ years of experience in education, the type of PS/Rtl training they have received, the school at which they work, and whether they are a member of a School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT). Frequencies of responses to these questions are presented in the Results section only for the sake of parsimony and to avoid repetition.

SURVEYS

Respondents were asked to complete three separate surveys. These were titled the Shared Beliefs Survey, the Perception of PS/Rtl Skills Survey and the PS/Rtl Beliefs Survey.

SHARED BELIEFS SURVEY³

The Shared Beliefs Survey consists of twelve questions concerning employees’ beliefs with regard to structuring the school environment to promote positive educational outcomes. Respondents rate their level of belief on a five-point scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. Inspection of items, which include, “School is important for a student’s success in life” and “All the people in a school should be treated with dignity and respect” appear to pull strongly for an affirmative response. All twelve questions are similarly positively worded. A factor analysis of the Shared Beliefs scale was not available prior to this evaluation. We conducted separate forms of factor analysis including principal components with varimax rotation and principal axis with promax rotation. Both forms of factor analysis yielded a clear one-factor solution in which all twelve items load on one general ‘positive support’ factor.

³ see attachment A

PERCEPTION OF SKILLS SURVEY⁴

The Perception of Skills Survey requires respondents to rate their skill across several PS/Rtl items on a five-point scale from NS “I do not have this skill at all” to VHS “I am highly skilled in this area and could teach others this skill”. A factor analysis conducted during scale development indicated a three factor solution. Factor one contains 25 items that reflect respondents’ perceptions of their PS/Rtl skills when addressing academic issues. Factor two contains 20 items that reflect respondents’ perceptions of their PS/Rtl skills when addressing behavior issues. Factor three contains 12 items that reflect respondents’ perceptions of their skills in accessing, interpreting, and graphing data. Internal reliability for each of these scales were excellent at .98, .98, and .94 respectively.

PS/RTI BELIEFS SURVEY⁵

The PS/Rtl Beliefs Survey requires respondents to indicate their level of agreement with statements that align with the tenets of a Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/Rtl) model. Responses to each item are provided on a five-point scale ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. Factor analysis conducted during scale development yielded a three-factor solution. Factor one contains 6 items related to the ability of students with disabilities to achieve academic benchmarks. Factor two contains 13 items related to data-based decision making. Factor three contains 4 items related to the functions of core and supplemental instruction. Internal reliability for each of these were satisfactory at .87, .79, and .85 respectively.

TIERS I AND II OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

A goal of this evaluation was to complete observation checklists to assess whether critical components of the Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention framework were present or absent during Problem-Solving Team/Data meetings at each school in the district. Observation checklist scores were then to be examined in relation to school-wide responses to the Perception of Skills and PS/Rtl Beliefs surveys. The evaluation also included an inter-rater reliability examination of the Tiers I and II Observation Checklist. However, Observation Checklists were only received from 9 schools. It was not possible to assess inter-rater reliability or conduct other analyses based upon these limited data. Examination of Observation Checklist data was deferred until further data can be obtained.

RESULTS

Survey results are examined in relation to job classification, school-based leadership team membership, training, experience in education, and school level (elementary, middle, etc.).⁶ Survey results are then provided for each individual school.

JOB CLASSIFICATION

JOB CLASSIFICATION BY SHARED BELIEFS

Results presented in Table 2 examined mean Shared Belief survey scores among employees in separate job classifications. Results indicate that Shared Beliefs scale means are restricted in range. All groups scored above 4.50 on this scale, which can range from 1 to 5. Significant differences do not exist in means across groups. These results suggest that further scale development efforts are necessary to address these limitations and enhance the utility of this scale.

⁴ see attachment B

⁵ see attachment C

⁶ Discussion of statistical analyses underlying the interpretation of results is excluded to enhance clarity.

	Shared Beliefs	
	Mean	N
School Administrator	4.81	96
Teacher-General Education	4.59	673
Teacher-ESE	4.54	202
ESE-Other	4.62	74
Instructional-Non Classroom	4.76	101
Counselor	4.57	122
Psychological Services	4.83	62
School Social Worker	4.66	49
Speech Therapist	4.74	26
Reading/Math Coach	4.62	58
PS/Rtl Coach	4.93	13
Total	4.63	1476

JOB CLASSIFICATION BY PERCEPTION OF PS/RTI SKILLS

Results presented in Table 3 below examine employees’ perception of their skills related to PS/Rtl across job classifications. Results indicate that Psychological Services staff and Reading/Math coaches reported significantly higher levels of Academic PS/Rtl skill relative to all other classifications except School Administrators, who in turn reported higher levels of Academic PS/Rtl skill relative to school counselors, school social workers, and ‘other’ exceptional education personnel. Psychological Services personnel reported a higher level of Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills relative to all other groups except School Social Workers and School Administrators. Administrators reported higher levels of Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills relative to Teachers and those in the ESE ‘other’ classification. A nearly identical pattern of results exist with respect to Data Manipulation with the exception that Psychological Services staff do not report a significantly higher level of skill relative to Reading/Math Coaches in this area.

Although our sample of PS/Rtl coaches was limited to 8 respondents, it is worth noting that the average ratings of 3.86, 3.77, and 3.35 for Academic, Behavioral and Data Manipulation skills respectively, fell below level 4 “I can use this skill with little support” when in fact this group should be close to a rating of 5 “I am highly skilled in this area and could teach others this skill” by definition of their role as a coach.

The average of a 4 rating for Academic PS/Rtl Skills for Psychological Services staff and Reading/Math Coaches was consistent with their role in facilitating the Academic PS/Rtl framework. Similarly, elevated levels of reported Behavioral PS/Rtl skills among Psychological Services and School Social Worker staff were consistent with their role in facilitating the Behavioral PS/Rtl framework.

Ratings closer to 3 for each of the remaining groups, with the exception of School Administrators, across the Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation domains suggests that these groups “have this skill but still need some support to use it”. Overall these results are consistent with what may be characterized as a sufficient level of skill necessary to successfully implement PS/Rtl. Results suggest that, on average, Psychological Services staff and Reading/Math coaches can take the lead in structuring Academic interventions while Psychological Services and School Social Work staff can take the lead in structuring Behavioral interventions. School-based instructional staff indicate on average that they possess the skill necessary to implement PS/Rtl when given sufficient support. School Administrators report possessing the skills necessary, on average, to provide additional support to instructional staff in the school context. These results are generally promising. However, these promising results must be interpreted with some caution as they may be artificially inflated due to sample self-selection bias.

Table 3: Mean Perception of PS/RtI Skills by Job Classification				
	Academic	Behavioral	Data Manipulation	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
School Administrator	3.81	3.80	3.42	72
Teacher-General Education	3.43	3.17	2.93	351
Teacher-ESE	3.51	3.33	2.90	123
ESE-Other	2.91	3.12	2.79	45
Instructional-Non Classroom	3.45	3.37	3.07	59
Counselor	3.25	3.40	2.80	78
Psychological Services	4.09	3.95	3.82	55
School Social Worker	2.69	3.53	3.33	35
Speech Therapist	3.05	2.64	2.45	18
Reading/Math Coach	4.16	3.26	3.32	40
PS/RtI Coach	3.86	3.77	3.35	8
Total	3.47	3.33	3.04	884

JOB CLASSIFICATION BY MEAN PS/RTI BELIEFS

Results presented in Table 4 below examine employees' beliefs related to PS/RtI across job classifications. Results indicated that School Administrators, Psychological Services staff, and Reading/Math coaches reported higher levels of agreement with PS/RtI Instructional philosophy and the core tenets of Data-Based Decision Making relative to both General Education and ESE Teachers. Belief in Data-Based Decision Making was particularly high among Psychological Services staff relative to all other groups. Overall means of 3.90 for Instruction and 3.88 for Data-Based Decision Making indicate that overall, those who completed this survey agree with PS/RtI instructional philosophy and data-based approaches. However, differences among groups suggest that Administrators, Psychological Services staff, and Reading/Math coaches are likely to show stronger support relative to teachers. These data also may represent a best-case scenario if those who believe most strongly in these tenets were most likely to complete this survey.

The pattern of results was somewhat different for the Student Academic Ability domain. School Administrators and PS/RtI Coaches reported the highest level of agreement for statements indicating that the majority of students with specific learning disabilities or emotional/behavioral disabilities achieve grade-level benchmarks and that students with disabilities who receive exceptional education services can achieve grade-level benchmarks. Notably, the mean level of agreement across raters with items in this domain is a 3 "neutral". These results do not provide strong support for the belief that all students with disabilities can achieve grade-level benchmarks if provided with support. These results also suggest that Administrators and PS/RtI Coaches may be the only groups of employees whose belief that the ultimate goals of PS/RtI can be attained are above a rating of 'neutral'.

Table 4: Mean PS/Rtl Beliefs by Job Classification				
	Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
School Administrator	4.33	3.49	4.08	58
Teacher-General Education	3.78	2.87	3.68	269
Teacher-ESE	3.65	2.95	3.80	92
ESE-Other	3.66	2.89	3.89	38
Instructional-Non Classroom	3.87	3.04	4.00	45
Counselor	4.00	3.11	3.91	57
Psychological Services	4.30	2.97	4.45	50
School Social Worker	3.90	3.11	4.06	31
Speech Therapist	3.75	2.79	4.03	13
Reading/Math Coach	4.29	3.03	4.01	30
PS/Rtl Coach	4.75	3.55	4.46	7
Total	3.90	3.00	3.88	690

Results presented in Table 5 examine Beliefs regarding Student Academic Ability at the level of each individual item in the scale. Results indicated that agreement was higher among School Administrators relative to General Education Teachers, ESE Teachers, and Psychological Services staff for each of the first four items stating that a majority of students identified as having a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) or Emotional Behavioral Disability (EBD) achieve grade level benchmarks in reading and math. Data for the 2008-2009 school year⁷ indicate that the majority of students with disabilities do not achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math. These results indicate that administrators may over-estimate the performance of students with disabilities relative to teachers and psychological services staff.

Results for the remaining two items indicate that both School Administrators and Psychological Services staff provide higher ratings of agreement relative to General Education and ESE Teachers with statements indicating that students with high incidence disabilities who are receiving exceptional student education services are capable of achieving grade-level benchmarks in reading and math. These results suggest that both administrators and psychological services staff may be more optimistic relative to teachers with regard to the potential of students with high incidence disabilities to attain grade-level benchmarks.

⁷ <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/default.asp>

Table 5: Means for Individual Student Academic Ability items by Job Classification							
	SLD (Reading)	SLD (Math)	EBD (Reading)	EBD (Math)	Capable (Reading)	Capable (Math)	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
School Administrator	3.33	3.31	3.34	3.40	3.79	3.79	58
Teacher-General Education	2.70	2.74	2.71	2.73	3.17	3.18	269
Teacher-ESE	2.73	2.78	2.83	2.83	3.27	3.26	92
ESE-Other	2.71	2.66	2.76	2.71	3.26	3.26	38
Instructional-Non Classroom	2.89	3.00	2.96	2.96	3.18	3.24	45
Counselor	2.95	2.93	2.89	2.88	3.51	3.49	57
Psychological Services	2.26	2.40	2.52	2.58	4.02	4.04	50
School Social Worker	2.97	3.03	2.84	2.81	3.52	3.52	31
Speech Therapist	2.38	2.54	2.54	2.62	3.31	3.38	13
Reading/Math Coach	2.73	2.80	2.83	2.90	3.43	3.50	30
PS/Rtl Coach	3.57	3.14	3.29	3.29	4.00	4.00	7
Total	2.78	2.81	2.81	2.83	3.37	3.38	690

SLD (Reading) = The majority of students identified as students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading.

SLD (Math) = The majority of students identified as students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in math.

EBD (Reading) = The majority of students identified with emotional behavioral disabilities (EBD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading.

EBD (Math) = The majority of students identified with emotional behavioral disabilities (EBD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in math.

Capable (Reading) = Students with high-incidence disabilities (e.g., Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Behavioral Disabilities, Other Health Impaired) who are receiving exceptional student education services are capable of achieving grade-level benchmarks (i.e., general education standards) in reading.

Capable (Math) = Students with high-incidence disabilities (e.g., Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Behavioral Disabilities, Other Health Impaired) who are receiving exceptional student education services are capable of achieving grade-level benchmarks (i.e., general education standards) in math.

SCHOOL-BASED LEADERSHIP TEAM

Results presented in Table 6 examine survey results based upon employees' membership in a School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT). Results indicated that employees' Shared Beliefs did not differ based upon membership in a SBLT. Results indicated that Perception of PS/Rtl Skills did differ across Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation domains. Similarly, results indicated that PS/Rtl Beliefs differed based upon SBLT membership across Instruction, Student Academic Ability, and Data-Based Decision Making domains.

The negative finding with regard to Shared Beliefs is consistent with the overall restriction of range in scores on this scale. Lack of variability in scores minimizes the ability of this scale to show differentiation across groups. We also may not necessarily expect there to be a difference in shared beliefs associated with positive behavioral support based upon membership in a School-Based Leadership Team.

While significant differences exist in Perception of Skills scale means based upon membership in a SBLT, they are not particularly large differences from a practical, applied standpoint. Academic and Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills means are closer to a "4" for SBLT members (3.63 and 3.55) compared to non-SBLT employees (3.33 and 3.15). However, none of these scores reach a "4" "I can use this skill with little support". Similarly, while the Data Manipulation Skills mean is higher for SBLT members (3.28) relative to non-SBLT members (2.85), both scores are closest to a "3" "I have this skill, but still need some support to use it" from a practical, applied standpoint. Earlier differences found in skills across job classifications appeared to present a clearer understanding of the dynamics of the PS/Rtl framework from an applied perspective than do results associated with SBLT membership.

The same conclusions are evident with respect to PS/Rtl Beliefs. While results indicated significant differences based upon SBLT membership across all three scales, the ratings of both SBLT and non-SBLT groups were closest to a “4” “Agree” for Instruction and Data-Based Decision Making and a “3” “Neutral” for Student Academic Ability.

Table 6: Survey Results based upon Membership in a School-Based Leadership Team											
		Shared Beliefs		Perception of PS/Rtl Skills				PS/Rtl Beliefs			
		Shared Beliefs		Academic PS/Rtl Skills	Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills	Data Manipulation Skills		Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
		Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
SBLT Member	No	4.62	941	3.33	3.15	2.85	506	3.73	2.90	3.73	376
	Yes	4.65	565	3.63	3.55	3.28	392	4.10	3.12	4.07	323
	Total	4.63	1506	3.46	3.32	3.04	898	3.90	3.00	3.88	699

EXPERIENCE

We examined each of the survey factors based upon respondents’ reports of their years of experience in education. Results yielded only one significant result in which first year staff reported less Academic PS/Rtl skills relative to those with more than one year of experience. However, given the sample size of 23 associated with this isolated finding we advise a cautious approach and do not over-interpret what this finding may mean without collecting further data.

TRAINING

Results presented in Table 7 examine differences in Perception of PS/Rtl Skills based upon participation in six different types of training. In most cases, participation in training was associated with higher perceptions of skills across domains. The only results that were not significantly different were for Data Manipulation Skills based upon PS/Rtl presentations in faculty meetings, and for Academic PS/Rtl Skills based upon either Training on Moodle or Other trainings on PS/Rtl.

Perception of PS/Rtl Skills were then examined based upon the number of training types attended. Results indicated significant differences in Academic PS/Rtl Skills, Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills, and Data Manipulation Skills based upon the number of training types attended. In each case, there was an increase in reported skill as the number of training types attended increased, and there were clear differences between those who received multiple trainings and those who received one or none.

From an applied standpoint, results indicate that respondents who reported receiving no training nevertheless averaged 2.96 on the Academic PS/Rtl Skills scale. In other words, among those who responded to the survey, they report a starting point of “3” “I have this skill, but still need some support to use it” prior to receipt of any training. Results suggest that District SBLT training, as well as training delivered through PLCs, faculty meetings and the state PS/Rtl online Moodle course can further increase perceptions of skill in this area.

In contrast, the starting point for Behavioral and Data Manipulation Skills are 2.59 and 2.50 respectively, which is between “2” “I have minimal skills in this area; need substantial support to use it” and “3” “I have this skill but still need some support to use it”. After receipt of one training, Behavioral PS/Rtl skills move above “3” to 3.14 while Data Manipulation skills increase significantly to 2.86. District SBLT, Moodle, and “Other” trainings appear to be the most useful to enhance Behavioral PS/Rtl and Data Manipulation Skills. Training through PLCs and Faculty Meetings appear to be less helpful in these areas.

Respondents to this survey did not appear to have substantial difficulty reaching a level “3” across Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation Skills areas. Reaching a level “4” “I can use this skill with little support” was associated with receipt of multiple types of

training. Those who believe they can use these skills with little support appear to be those who are immersed in the PS/Rtl framework and have received multiple trainings.

Table 7: Perception of PS/Rtl Skills based upon Participation in Training					
		Academic PS/Rtl Skills	Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills	Data Manipulation Skills	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	N
Participated in District SBLT Training	No	3.34	3.15	2.87	554
	Yes	3.66	3.60	3.32	344
PS/Rtl Training delivered through school based PLCs	No	3.34	3.24	2.96	423
	Yes	3.57	3.40	3.12	475
PS/Rtl Presentation in Faculty Meetings	No	3.28	3.21	2.97	281
	Yes	3.55	3.37	3.07	617
State PS/Rtl online Moodle course	No	3.42	3.26	2.95	754
	Yes	3.69	3.63	3.52	144
Training on Moodle	No	3.44	3.25	2.95	691
	Yes	3.56	3.55	3.33	207
Other trainings on PS/Rtl	No	3.44	3.22	2.94	622
	Yes	3.52	3.54	3.28	276
Total Types of Training Attended	0	2.96	2.59	2.50	39
	1	3.29	3.14	2.86	267
	2	3.49	3.30	2.96	266
	3	3.61	3.43	3.16	159
	4	3.44	3.60	3.20	82
	5	3.82	3.77	3.67	51
	6	4.02	3.91	3.86	34
Total		3.46	3.32	3.04	898

Results presented in Table 8 indicate that Psychological Services staff are those most likely to have participated in 5 or 6 different types of training. Taken together, results presented in Tables 7 and 8 indicate that those who attend 5 or 6 types of training are most likely to report mean PS/Rtl Skills levels in the “4” range and that these employees are most likely to be Psychological Services staff with 61.2% engaging in 5 or 6 types of training. Additionally, among School Social Workers, 23.2% reported engaging in 5 or 6 types of training, while this number fell below 10% among all other groups.

Table 8: Number of Trainings Attended by Group															
	0		1		2		3		4		5		6		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
School Administrator	11	9.1%	19	15.7%	22	18.2%	31	25.6%	27	22.3%	7	5.8%	4	3.3%	121
Teacher-General Education	122	15.0%	290	35.5%	247	30.3%	110	13.5%	27	3.3%	13	1.6%	7	0.9%	816
Teacher-ESE	24	10.3%	97	41.5%	69	29.5%	35	15.0%	5	2.1%	3	1.3%	1	0.4%	234
ESE-Other	16	17.8%	30	33.3%	21	23.3%	12	13.3%	8	8.9%	3	3.3%	0	0.0%	90
Instructional-Non Classroom	20	15.9%	45	35.7%	23	18.3%	23	18.3%	10	7.9%	2	1.6%	3	2.4%	126
Counselor	11	7.9%	40	28.8%	28	20.1%	27	19.4%	22	15.8%	9	6.5%	2	1.4%	139
Psychological Services	2	3.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.5%	10	14.9%	11	16.4%	17	25.4%	24	35.8%	67
School Social Worker	4	7.1%	7	12.5%	15	26.8%	10	17.9%	7	12.5%	9	16.1%	4	7.1%	56
Speech Therapist	3	9.1%	10	30.3%	5	15.2%	14	42.4%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33
Reading/Math Coach	9	12.9%	20	28.6%	21	30.0%	12	17.1%	6	8.6%	2	2.9%	0	0.0%	70
PS/Rtl Coach	1	6.2%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	4	25.0%	1	6.2%	6	37.5%	1	6.2%	16
Total	223	12.6%	561	31.7%	454	25.7%	288	16.3%	125	7.1%	71	4.0%	46	2.6%	1768

SCHOOL LEVEL

Results presented in Table 9 examine survey results by school level. Results indicated a small effect in which Shared Beliefs among Elementary School staff (4.67) were significantly higher than those among Middle School staff (4.51). This effect may underlie a slightly higher tendency toward acceptance of the philosophy behind PS/Rtl at the Elementary School level relative to the Middle School level.

Results indicated that staff who serve multiple schools rate their Academic PS/Rtl Skills more highly than do staff in middle schools and ESE centers. They also rate their Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills more highly than do staff who serve elementary and high schools, and their Data Manipulation Skills more highly than do those who serve ESE centers. These differences are essentially a proxy for higher skill levels reported by Psychological Services staff, who often serve multiple schools.

Results indicated that reports concerning the Instructional philosophy of PS/Rtl are significantly higher among elementary school staff (4.03) and staff serving multiple schools (4.04) than among middle school (3.75) and high school (3.62) staff. Beliefs concerning Data-Based Decision Making are also significantly higher among elementary staff (3.91) relative to high school staff (3.63). Results also indicate that beliefs concerning Data-Based Decision Making are stronger among staff serving multiple schools (4.17) relative to all other groups. Significant differences did not exist in perceptions of Student Academic Ability across school levels.

The absolute level of differences between school levels on the PS/Rtl Beliefs scales is not large. All means are closer to “4” “Agree” than to “3” “Neutral” with regard to Instruction and Data-Based Decision Making. However, the decline in means from elementary school to high school may underlie a slightly stronger resistance to the instructional philosophy behind PS/Rtl among staff as students progress through school. There is also the consistent finding that staff are “neutral” in their opinion regarding the relationship between student academic ability and achievement regardless of how the data are parsed. Taken together, these data suggest that doubt may exist regarding the degree to which the PS/Rtl approach can be effective for all students. Doubts regarding the potential effectiveness of PS/Rtl may affect the willingness of staff to engage in instructional and data-based decision making practices as students progress through school.

Table 9: Survey Results by Level										
	Shared Beliefs		Perception of PS/Rtl Skills				PS/Rtl Beliefs			
	Shared Beliefs		Academic PS/Rtl Skills	Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills	Data Manipulation Skills		Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
Elementary Schools	4.67	720	3.47	3.24	2.91	452	4.03	3.04	3.91	345
Middle Schools	4.51	220	3.36	3.43	3.19	119	3.75	2.95	3.77	92
High Schools	4.54	281	3.44	3.21	3.02	144	3.62	2.93	3.63	112
ESE Centers	4.75	90	3.26	3.56	3.00	55	3.72	2.95	3.86	43
Adult Education Centers	4.50	4	1.64	1.64	1.42	1				0
Multiple Schools	4.68	174	3.71	3.60	3.45	117	4.04	3.02	4.17	98
District Assignment	4.86	17	3.11	3.07	3.10	10	3.67	2.93	3.94	9
Total	4.63	1506	3.46	3.32	3.04	898	3.9	3	3.88	699

SCHOOL-LEVEL SURVEY RESULTS

Results in Tables 10A-10D are presented for informational purposes only. Sample sizes were too small to conduct meaningful analyses of survey results by school.

Table 10A: Survey Results by School: Elementary Schools										
	Shared Beliefs		Perception of PS/Rtl Skills				PS/Rtl Beliefs			
	Shared Beliefs		Academic PS/Rtl Skills	Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills	Data Manipulation Skills		Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
74th Street ES	4.64	15	3.76	3.28	3.76	8	3.95	2.93	3.98	10
Anona ES	4.67	6	3.57	3.61	4.20	3	3.75	3.17	4.22	2
Azalea ES	4.37	9	3.13	2.60	2.13	5	4.00	2.71	3.75	4
Bardmoor ES	4.82	15	3.18	2.82	2.70	12	3.77	3.30	3.86	11
Bauder ES	4.81	6	3.66	3.40	3.35	4	5.00	2.67	4.46	1
Bay Point ES	4.98	4	3.64	3.48	3.06	3	3.50	3.00	4.23	1
Bay Vista Fund ES	4.74	9	3.44	3.15	2.96	6	3.33	2.67	3.72	3
Bear Creek ES	4.88	9	3.98	3.61	3.22	4	4.83	3.11	4.74	3
Belcher ES	4.66	12	3.05	2.90	2.78	8	4.67	3.69	4.04	6
Belleair ES	4.91	8	3.37	3.52	2.40	4	4.62	3.04	4.25	4
Blanton ES	4.55	12	3.79	3.49	3.00	8	3.00	3.06	3.42	8
Brooker Creek ES	4.78	8	3.18	3.31	2.17	4	4.25	3.38	3.70	4
Campbell Park ES	4.10	13	3.39	3.45	2.98	7	4.25	3.50	4.15	6
Cross Bayou ES	4.81	16	3.28	3.25	2.94	12	3.89	2.59	3.46	9

Curlew Creek ES	4.79	8	3.48	3.23	2.52	4	3.50	3.17	3.23	1
Curtis Fund	4.68	11	3.29	3.35	2.88	6	4.00	3.20	4.17	5
Cypress Woods ES	4.75	19	3.62	3.40	2.87	13	4.11	3.06	3.96	11
Dunedin ES	4.79	13	3.27	3.06	2.71	6	4.25	3.38	3.63	4
Eisenhower ES	4.80	13	3.28	2.76	2.26	12	4.11	3.04	3.75	9
Fairmount Park ES	4.27	9	3.45	2.94	2.90	8	4.04	2.93	3.67	7
Forest Lakes ES	4.67	6	3.83	3.06	3.48	3	4.62	4.33	4.08	2
Frontier ES	4.94	12	3.77	3.40	2.71	9	4.00	2.89	3.79	3
Fuguitt ES	3.97	5	2.46	3.23	2.79	2	3.75	3.00	3.87	3
Garrison-Jones ES	4.70	7	3.32	2.84	2.79	4	4.67	3.22	4.28	3
Gulfport ES	4.74	13	4.07	3.34	3.24	9	4.50	3.35	4.22	9
High Point ES	4.79	18	3.13	2.80	2.62	8	3.58	2.58	3.67	6
Highland Lakes ES	3.97	5	3.79	4.00	3.25	1	5.00	3.67	3.92	1
Jamerson ES	4.46	14	3.59	3.66	3.05	7	3.50	2.52	3.71	7
Lake St. George ES	4.65	7	3.49	3.05	2.78	5	4.00	2.93	3.91	5
Lakeview Fund	4.84	6	3.48	2.97	2.97	3	5.00	4.17	3.85	1
Lakewood ES	4.77	10	3.58	3.29	3.10	6	3.95	2.90	3.94	5
Lealman ES	4.41	8	4.36	3.64	3.68	6	4.00	3.58	3.88	4
Leila Davis ES	4.18	6	3.12	2.89	2.45	4	4.75	2.92	4.35	4
Lynch ES	4.75	7	3.95	4.07	3.00	4	4.25	2.58	3.79	4
Madeira Beach Fund	4.74	13	3.96	3.47	3.26	7	3.80	3.40	3.62	5
Maximo ES	4.90	6	3.77	3.36	3.26	4	3.60	3.03	3.91	5
McMullen-Booth ES	4.71	9	3.57	3.58	2.96	5	3.75	2.75	3.98	4
Melrose ES	4.68	11	3.78	3.78	3.58	7	4.31	2.92	3.88	4
Mildred Helms ES	4.56	12	2.21	2.10	1.98	7	4.14	3.10	4.05	7
Mount Vernon ES	4.83	11	2.59	3.23	2.88	4	4.00	2.83	3.73	4
New Heights ES	4.79	7	3.10	3.45	3.17	3	4.00	3.67	3.84	3
North Shore ES	4.75	8	3.09	2.55	2.80	5	4.38	3.42	4.04	4
Northwest ES	4.37	7	3.80	3.39	3.42	4	4.33	3.28	4.36	3
Oakhurst ES	4.90	6	2.98	3.06	3.03	3	4.00	3.33	4.23	1
Oldsmar ES	4.66	17	3.14	2.84	2.58	13	4.31	3.40	4.01	12
Orange Grove ES	3.67	3	3.00	2.91	2.67	2	4.00	3.33	3.77	1
Ozona ES	3.43	6	3.43	2.73	2.78	3	3.50	2.83	3.35	2
Pasadena Fund	4.81	6	3.59	3.68	2.80	4	3.83	2.22	3.49	3
Perkins ES	4.49	11	3.19	2.87	2.63	9	4.00	2.40	3.92	5
Pinellas Central ES	4.85	8	3.69	3.51	2.85	6	4.50	3.60	4.20	5
Pinellas Park ES	4.67	6	3.49	4.02	3.55	5	3.75	2.79	3.94	4
Plumb ES	4.75	17	3.12	2.61	2.31	12	3.72	2.83	3.88	9
Ponce de Leon ES	4.53	10	3.32	3.23	2.88	7	4.20	2.60	4.22	5
Rawlings ES	4.38	10	3.71	3.68	3.24	7	3.71	3.17	3.66	7
Ridgecrest ES	4.81	10	3.60	3.35	2.91	8	3.83	2.67	3.99	6
Safety Harbor ES	4.31	7	2.99	3.35	2.81	5	3.38	2.83	3.65	4
San Jose ES	4.95	7	3.25	3.11	2.83	5	4.19	2.83	3.88	4

Sanderlin ES	4.88	5	3.61	3.23	3.04	2	3.50	2.67	4.38	2
Sandy Lane ES	4.86	17	4.14	3.98	3.65	11	3.91	3.04	4.00	8
Sawgrass ES	4.52	11	3.73	3.56	3.13	7	4.30	3.00	4.23	5
Seminole ES	4.67	11	3.11	2.47	2.05	5	3.50	2.78	4.00	3
Sexton ES	4.79	8	3.40	3.25	2.61	5	4.25	3.00	3.90	4
Shore Acres ES	4.85	12	4.02	3.87	3.72	7	3.50	2.50	3.77	2
Skycrest ES	4.79	9	3.43	2.97	2.62	6	3.92	2.97	3.76	6
Skyview ES	4.96	14	3.22	2.83	2.44	11	4.08	2.81	3.87	6
Southern Oak ES	4.84	9	3.26	3.25	2.75	5	4.20	3.00	4.06	5
Starkey ES	4.60	11	3.83	3.17	2.82	8	4.00	2.50	3.90	4
Sunset Hills ES	4.51	9	3.14	2.85	2.41	5	3.75	3.50	3.81	2
Sutherland ES	4.70	11	3.40	3.12	2.62	6	4.17	3.39	3.69	3
Tarpon Fund	4.08	5	4.21	4.18	3.38	2	4.50	2.67	3.38	1
Tarpon Springs ES	4.79	9	3.61	3.56	2.98	5	3.17	2.22	3.73	3
Walsingham ES	5.00	4	4.05	4.33	3.39	3	3.00	3.17	4.31	1
Westgate ES	4.51	13	3.89	4.02	3.52	9	4.88	4.10	4.34	8
Woodlawn ES	4.82	15	3.55	3.23	3.17	12	4.17	2.85	3.91	9
Total	4.67	720	3.47	3.24	2.91	452	4.03	3.04	3.91	345

Table 10B: Survey Results by School: Middle Schools

	Shared Beliefs		Perception of PS/Rtl Skills				PS/Rtl Beliefs			
	Shared Beliefs		Academic PS/Rtl Skills	Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills	Data Manipulation Skills		Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
Azalea MS	4.31	15	3.04	3.33	2.94	8	3.45	2.87	3.58	5
Bay Point MS	4.60	12	3.21	3.24	3.12	10	3.58	3.06	3.73	6
Carwise MS	4.85	13	3.62	3.64	3.54	8	3.84	3.15	3.74	8
Clearwater Intermediate	4.57	4	2.29	2.36	1.42	1	4.00	3.25	3.77	2
Dunedin MS	4.64	15	3.38	3.57	3.39	7	4.00	2.67	4.14	5
Fitzgerald MS	4.62	15	3.19	3.24	3.28	5	3.62	2.67	4.00	4
Hopkins MS	4.22	20	3.12	3.27	3.35	12	3.92	2.92	3.81	6
Largo MS	4.71	4	2.79	2.91	1.83	1	2.75	2.00	3.73	2
Lealman Intermediate	4.43	7	3.75	4.09	4.46	2	4.00	3.67	3.96	2
Meadowlawn MS	3.99	8	2.94	2.80	2.22	5	3.70	3.00	3.85	5
Oak Grove MS	4.26	15	3.96	3.84	3.35	8	4.00	2.76	4.04	7
Osceola MS	4.86	9	3.81	3.81	3.10	7	3.12	2.50	3.39	4
Palm Harbor MS	4.58	13	3.40	3.61	3.47	8	3.35	2.80	3.74	5
Pinellas Park MS	4.67	10	3.48	3.23	2.99	4	4.00	2.94	3.74	3
Safety Harbor MS	4.65	11	3.73	3.45	2.84	4	4.00	3.47	3.65	5
Seminole MS	4.43	17	3.04	3.05	2.98	12	3.95	2.73	3.74	10
Tarpon Springs MS	4.55	13	3.70	3.90	3.21	7	4.05	3.67	3.75	5
Thurgood Marshall Fundamental MS	4.12	6	3.14	3.24	3.86	3	3.38	2.58	3.46	2
Tyrone MS	4.79	13	3.39	3.60	3.36	7	3.62	3.11	3.71	6
Total	4.51	220	3.36	3.43	3.19	119	3.75	2.95	3.77	92

Table 10C: Survey Results by School: High Schools

	Shared Beliefs		Perception of PS/Rtl Skills				PS/Rtl Beliefs			
	Shared Beliefs		Academic PS/Rtl Skills	Behavioral PS/Rtl Skills	Data Manipulation Skills		Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
Bayside HS	4.80	10	2.97	2.85	2.75	5	3.60	2.27	3.89	5
Boca Ciega HS	4.53	13	3.40	3.34	3.13	7	3.17	2.78	3.08	6
Clearwater HS	4.42	15	3.99	3.30	3.51	7	3.17	2.97	3.47	6
Countryside HS	4.58	32	3.44	3.11	3.10	20	3.60	2.78	3.59	15
Dixie Hollins HS	4.46	19	3.64	3.53	3.31	10	3.78	3.04	3.95	9
Dunedin HS	4.65	10	4.00	3.68	3.56	4	3.50	2.93	3.55	5
East Lake HS	4.70	11	3.65	3.67	3.44	6	4.38	3.92	4.32	4
Gibbs HS	4.66	27	3.58	3.39	2.90	16	3.94	2.93	3.68	9
Lakewood HS	4.79	16	3.61	2.86	3.36	4	3.70	2.40	3.43	5
Largo HS	4.67	12	3.10	2.64	2.68	7	3.60	2.97	3.68	5
Northeast HS	4.13	15	3.96	4.00	3.83	6	4.12	3.08	3.90	6
Osceola HS	3.68	5	4.14	3.76	3.03	3	2.00	2.00	2.85	1
Palm Harbor University HS	4.63	13	3.36	3.41	2.71	6	3.38	3.08	3.48	4
Pinellas Park HS	4.43	20	3.17	3.14	2.98	9	3.21	2.98	3.59	7
Seminole HS	4.58	19	3.78	3.39	3.10	9	3.56	2.83	3.60	8
St Petersburg HS	4.58	14	2.82	2.65	2.60	7	4.00	2.56	3.36	3
Tarpon Springs HS	4.48	30	2.96	2.80	2.52	18	3.62	3.24	3.62	14
Total	4.54	281	3.44	3.21	3.02	144	3.62	2.93	3.63	112

Table 10D: Survey Results by School: ESE, Adult Education, Multiple Schools, and District Assignment groups										
	Shared Beliefs		Perception of PS/RtI Skills				PS/RtI Beliefs			
	Shared Beliefs		Academic PS/RtI Skills	Behavioral PS/RtI Skills	Data Manipulation Skills		Instruction	Student Academic Ability	Data Based Decision Making	
	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N	Mean	Mean	Mean	N
Calvin Hunsinger	4.73	15	3.44	3.81	3.16	14	3.09	2.64	3.74	11
Dropout Prevention	4.59	2	2.50	2.64	2.08	1	4.00	3.33	4.08	1
Hamilton Disston	4.47	10	2.69	3.20	2.31	6	3.17	2.78	3.38	3
Nina Harris	4.73	18	2.94	2.89	2.32	5	3.80	3.00	3.62	5
Paul B Stephens	4.83	25	3.20	3.38	2.85	17	3.91	2.98	3.97	14
Pinellas Secondary	4.91	8	3.03	3.18	3.37	5	4.25	3.08	3.94	4
Richard Sanders	4.81	12	4.04	4.69	4.02	7	4.30	3.40	4.23	5
Total	4.75	90	3.26	3.56	3.00	55	3.72	2.95	3.86	43
PTEC Clearwater	4.50	3	1.64	1.64	1.42	1				
PTEC St Petersburg	4.50	1								
Multiple Schools	4.68	174	3.71	3.60	3.45	117	4.04	3.02	4.17	98
District Assignment	4.86	17	3.11	3.07	3.10	10	3.67	2.93	3.94	9

CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this evaluation was to examine perceptions of PCS staff with regard to their own skills implementing PS/RtI practices as well as their beliefs regarding PS/RtI. Employees across several job classifications were asked to rate their perception of their Academic PS/RtI, Behavioral PS/RtI, and Data Manipulation skills. Respondents were also asked to state their level of agreement with the role of Instruction and Data-Based Decision Making in the PS/RtI framework as well as their perceptions of Student Academic Ability of students with disabilities to achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math. A separate scale intended to assess Shared Beliefs regarding the role of Positive Behavior Support in the school setting was also administered. However, results derived from this scale suggested that responses were restricted in range and that this scale requires further development.

POSITIVE BIAS

Results were likely skewed toward a positive bias throughout this evaluation as a minority of staff completed the surveys and many who began completing the survey discontinued participation. This may have been due to the time necessary to complete the surveys. It is possible that those who did complete the surveys were either more invested in the PS/RtI framework or more willing to donate their time in support of its evaluation. Both of these scenarios would likely skew the data in a positive direction. Despite these limitations, the data did provide potentially useful insights into the practice of PS/RtI in PCS.

TEAM APPROACH

Results suggested that Psychological Services staff and Reading/Math Coaches were comfortable implementing Academic PS/RtI practices with minimal support. Similarly, Psychological Services staff and School Social Work staff were comfortable implementing Behavioral PS/RtI practices with minimal support. Both Psychological Services staff and Reading/Math coaches were comfortable structuring the Data Manipulation necessary to implement PS/RtI. School Administrators also reported an elevated level of skill with

respect to these processes relative to Teachers. Across Academic, Behavioral, and Data Manipulation domains, teachers reported that on average they “have this skill but still need some support to use it”. From a team-based perspective, these results suggest that school psychologists, school social workers, and reading/math coaches believe they have the skill necessary to support teachers during implementation of the PS/RtI framework. School administrators may have the skill necessary to facilitate implementation as well.

REPORTED SKILL OF PS/RTI COACHES

Although the sample size was too small to draw firm conclusions, it is worth noting that those who identified themselves as PS/RtI coaches did not, on average, report sufficient skill to implement PS/RtI with minimal support. Perhaps this group was being overly conservative in their ratings. However, it is necessary to ensure that those who are training others in the PS/RtI framework believe that they have mastered it themselves.

TRAINING

Results suggested that all groups believe that they have the skill necessary to implement the Academic PS/RtI framework prior to receipt of any training. Results suggest that district SBLT training or training received through an online Moodle course can provide staff with what they believe are the necessary Behavioral PS/RtI and Data Manipulation skills. Results suggested that being able to use PS/RtI skills with minimal support was associated with receipt of multiple trainings. Psychological Services staff were most likely to have received multiple PS/RtI training experiences.

SCHOOL LEVEL

Findings indicated that agreement with beliefs related to the Instructional philosophy associated with PS/RtI and engagement in Data-Based Decision Making declines as students move from Elementary through High School. While differences were not large, they may reflect less confidence or willingness to engage in the PS/RtI framework as students advance through school. There may be a perception that students in elementary school may be more likely to benefit from intervention whereas if a student at a higher grade level has not shown improvement there may be less confidence in the potential of the PS/RtI framework to facilitate successful outcomes.

STUDENT ACADEMIC ABILITY

Beliefs regarding the potential of students with disabilities to benefit from PS/RtI are a core issue that is tied directly to the philosophy of No Child Left Behind. The question is whether, given the best possible support within the PS/RtI framework, a student with a specific learning disability or an emotional behavioral disability can achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math.

Data from 2008-2009 indicate that 34% of students with disabilities in PCS were at or above grade-level in reading and 38% were at or above grade-level in math⁸. Students with disabilities in categories SLD, EBD, or OHI did not achieve benchmarks in reading or math at a rate above 40%⁹. Data from the current evaluation indicate that, on average, school administrators agree that the majority of students with SLD and EBD are at grade-level in reading and math. Ratings by administrators are significantly higher than those of teachers and psychologists in their assessment of whether the majority of students with SLD or EBD are at grade-level in reading and math. These data indicate that administrators may have false assumptions regarding current rates at which students with disabilities achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math.

Data also indicated that administrators and psychologists provide higher agreement ratings than do teachers when asked if a student with a high incidence disability, if provided with support, can achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math. Given data indicating that two-thirds of students with disabilities do not achieve grade-level benchmarks, there is a large discrepancy between outcomes that administrators and psychologists believe are possible and outcomes that currently occur. Across all respondents the average response to the question of whether students with disabilities can achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading and math are 3.37 and 3.38 respectively, with a “3” indicating a “neutral” response and a “4” indicate an “Agree” response.

⁸ <http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/default.asp>

⁹ percent of students achieving benchmarks for PCS grades 3-10: SLD Reading = 24%; SLD Math = 30%; EBD Reading = 28%; EBD Math = 29%; OHI Reading = 38%; OHI Math = 36%

Given response rates that suggest this sample may have a positive bias, an assessment just above “neutral” to a question that relates to whether PS/RtI can be effective is not optimal and suggests that doubt exists among staff concerning the potential for PS/RtI to be effective.

EFFECTIVENESS

The primary question with regard to the PS/RtI framework is whether it results in objectively quantifiable gains in achievement. A wealth of empirical research has supported the overarching Positive Behavioral Support approach of which RtI is a part¹⁰. However, the successful application of PS/RtI to specific difficulties encountered by individual students in targeted “tier 3” interventions is not yet clear.

Data from this evaluation suggest that teachers can participate in the PS/RtI framework with sufficient support. Psychological services staff have been trained to lead PS/RtI efforts, while school social workers can provide support for behavior and reading/math coaches can provide support for academic concerns. However, this evaluation does not address the quality of the content that is delivered to address academic and behavioral concerns. Support staff may be comfortable with the framework. However, if the content isn’t effective then PS/RtI will not be effective.

Once systems are in place to guide the PS/RtI framework in each school, the question of whether PS/RtI is effective in Pinellas County must be addressed empirically. Optimally, such an evaluation should also examine the conditions under which PS/RtI can be successful. If a student has a severe learning disability and can only read and write on a first-grade level when in the sixth-grade, can we expect that this student will achieve grade-level benchmarks? Similarly if a student with an emotional behavioral disability states openly that he wants to fail the FCAT test then what is the likelihood that this student will achieve grade-level benchmarks given the best possible instruction and behavioral supports? While these are arguably extreme cases, they highlight the likelihood that there may not be a direct relationship between teacher quality, intervention strategies, support and outcomes. Going forward, we must identify the conditions under which the PS/RtI framework can be successful. Ultimately, answers to this question can inform the philosophy, policy, and practices associated with No Child Left Behind.

SCHOOL-BASED PROCESSES

It was the intention of this evaluation to examine data by school. There is likely variability in implementation across schools. However, we did not receive a sufficient response to be able to do so reliably. The insufficient response rate highlights the magnitude of the challenge of implementing PS/RtI reliably and successfully in a district as large as Pinellas. Nevertheless, it is necessary to continue efforts to implement and monitor PS/RtI reliably across schools throughout the district.

¹⁰ OSEP Center on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (2007). Is school-wide positive behavior support an evidence-based practice? A research summary. (see also www.pbis.org)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Continue to seek and obtain support from Florida's Positive Behavior Support: Response to Intervention Project. Successful implementation of PS/RtI in Pinellas will depend, in part, upon the quality of support received from experts who have constructed the PS/RtI framework.
- 2) Continued provision of training for support staff in psychological services, school social work, and reading/math coaches can continue to build a strong support base from which teachers can receive the support they need in the PS/RtI framework. Data from this evaluation suggest that Psychological Services, School Social Workers and Reading/Math coaches are playing a central role in the implementation of PS/RtI. These results are understandable given the expertise of specialists in these areas. Continued efforts to leverage this support can maximize the effectiveness of interventions and provide the best possible support for teachers.
- 3) Encourage teacher participation in online training through Moodle. Data suggest that Behavioral PS/RtI and Data Manipulation skills in particular can be challenging to teachers. However, participation in one online Moodle course coupled with presentations at faculty meetings can provide enough of a foundation in PS/RtI for teachers to participate effectively in the framework. In the absence of such training, teachers may require increased levels of assistance from support staff.
- 4) Monitor consistency at the school level. This study was intended to do just that. However, the length of the surveys may have depressed staff participation levels. Similarly, an attempt to provide observation data for team meetings met with minimal response. Monitoring a framework this complex across a district this large can be difficult. However, continued attempts should be made to do so.
- 5) Reliable implementation of PS/RtI requires streamlined, effective communication between leadership of Psychological Services, School Social Workers, Reading/Math Coaches, PS/RtI Coaches and School Based Leadership Teams. Information concerning training in PS/RtI, the specific intervention strategies within PS/RtI, and data examining the effectiveness of PS/RtI must flow through these channels. A framework as complex as PS/RtI requires continued development and maintenance of a strong, streamlined communication network.
- 6) Monitor effectiveness in terms of clear outcomes. A major obstacle to implementation is a perception that PS/RtI may not produce effective results. As PS/RtI systems are implemented at the school level, PCS should examine whether PS/RtI is associated with success, for which students, under which conditions, and in terms of which outcomes. Tracking results for students at the individual school level and in terms of achievement test scores will require a concerted effort. However, the ultimate success of PS/RtI will necessarily depend upon proof of its effectiveness.

ATTACHMENT A

RtI Survey

Shared Beliefs

PS/RTI Survey 2010

6. Shared Belief Questions

If you do not have a response to any part of the following questions, please leave it blank.

1. Please rate your level of belief for each of the statements below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
School is important to a student's success in life.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
All the people in a school should be treated with dignity and respect.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
I believe students come first.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
All the adults in a school bear the ultimate responsibility for making the school safe, civil, and productive.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
All students should perceive unconditional acceptance and high expectations from school personnel.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
All students should receive frequent positive feedback on their behavioral and academic efforts.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
All school setting should be structured for success.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
All school personnel need to establish firm and clear limits for students.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Expectations for student behavior in all school settings should be clear, consistent, equitable, and directly taught to students.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Student misbehavior should be corrected calmly, consistently, and immediately by any staff member who observes it.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Addressing chronic student misbehavior is a collaborative responsibility involving the entire staff.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Teachers should have flexibility when designing their own classroom management plans, but their plans should conform to school effectiveness research.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

ATTACHMENT B

RtI Survey

Perception of Skills

PS/RTI Survey 2010

7. Perceptions of RtI Skills

Directions: Please read each statement about a skill related to assessment, instruction, and/or intervention below, and then evaluate YOUR skill level within the context of working at a school/building level.

Where indicated, rate your skill separately for academics (i.e., reading and math) and behavior.

Please use the following response scale:

NS = I do not have this skill at all

MnS = I have minimal skills in this area; need substantial support to use it

SS = I have this skill, but still need some support to use it

HS = I can use this skill with little support

VHS = I am highly skilled in this area and could teach others this skill

If you do not have a response to any part of the following questions, please leave it blank.

1. Please rate your skill to:

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Access the data necessary to determine the percent of students in core instruction who are achieving benchmarks (district grade-level standards) in academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access the data necessary to determine the percent of students in core instruction who are achieving benchmarks (district grade-level standards) in behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Use data <i>to make decisions</i> about individuals and groups of students for the core academic curriculum.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Use data <i>to make decisions</i> about individuals and groups of students for the core/building discipline plan.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

PS/RTI Survey 2010

2. Please rate your skill to perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student whom concerns have been raised.

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Define the referral concern in terms of a target skill (i.e., what the student should be able to do) instead of a referral <i>problem</i> for academics.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Define the referral concern in terms of a target skill (i.e., what the student should be able to do) instead of a referral <i>problem</i> for behavior.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Use data to define the current level of performance of the target student for academics.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Use data to define the current level of performance of the target student for behavior.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Determine the desired level of performance (i.e., benchmark) for academics.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Determine the desired level of performance (i.e., benchmark) for behavior.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Determine the current level of peer performance for the same skill as the target student for academics.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Determine the current level of peer performance for the same skill as the target student for behavior.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Calculate the gap between student current performance and the benchmark (district grade level standard) for academics.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Calculate the gap between student current performance and the benchmark (district grade level standard) for behavior.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Use gap data to determine whether core instruction should be adjusted or whether supplemental instruction should be directed to the target student for academics.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0
Use gap data to determine whether core instruction should be adjusted or whether supplemental instruction should be directed to the target student for behavior.	J0	J0	J0	J0	J0

PS/RTI Survey 2010

3. Please rate your skill to:

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Develop potential reasons (hypotheses) that a student or group of students is/are not achieving desired levels of performance (i.e., benchmarks) for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Develop potential reasons (hypotheses) that a student or group of students is/are not achieving desired levels of performance (i.e., benchmarks) for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Identify the most appropriate type(s) of data to use for determining reasons (hypotheses) that are likely to be contributing to the problem for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Identify the most appropriate type(s) of data to use for determining reasons (hypotheses) that are likely to be contributing to the problem for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access resources (e.g., internet resources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for academic core curricula.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access resources (e.g., internet resources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for behavioral core curricula.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access resources (e.g., internet resources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for academic supplemental curricula.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access resources (e.g., internet resources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for behavioral supplemental curricula.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access resources (e.g., internet resources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for academic individualized intervention plans.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Access resources (e.g., internet resources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for behavioral individualized intervention plans.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Ensure that any supplemental and/or intensive interventions are integrated with core instruction in the general education classroom for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Ensure that any supplemental and/or intensive interventions are integrated with core instruction in the general education classroom for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Ensure that the proposed intervention plan is supported by the data that were collected for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Ensure that the proposed intervention plan is supported by the data that were collected for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Provide the support necessary to ensure that the intervention is implemented appropriately for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Provide the support necessary to ensure that the intervention is implemented appropriately for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Determine if an intervention was implemented as it was intended to for academics.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Determine if an intervention was implemented as it was intended to for behavior.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Select appropriate data (e.g., Curriculum-Based Measurement, FAIR, FCAT, behavioral observations) to use for progress monitoring the student performance during academic interventions.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
Select appropriate data (e.g., Curriculum-Based Measurement, FAIR, FCAT, behavioral observations) to use for progress monitoring the student performance during behavioral interventions.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

PS/RTI Survey 2010

4. Please rate your skill to:

Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students.

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Graph target student data	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Graph benchmark data	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Graph peer data	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Draw and aimline	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Draw a trendline	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

5. Please rate your skill to:

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Interpret graphed progress monitoring data to make decision about the degree to which a student is responding to intervention (e.g., positive, questionable or poor response.)	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Make modifications to intervention plans based on student response to intervention.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Use appropriate data to differentiate between students who have not learned skills (e.g., did not have adequate exposure to effective instruction, not ready, got too far behind) from those who have barriers to learning due to a disability.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

6. Please rate your skill to:

Collect the following types of data.

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Curriculum-Based Measurement	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
FAIR	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Access data from appropriate district- or school-wide assessments	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Standard behavioral observations	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

7. Please rate your skill to:

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Disaggregate data by race, gender, free/reduced lunch, language proficiency, and disability status.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

8. Please rate your skill to:

Use technology in the following ways.

	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
Access the internet to locate sources of academic and behavioral evidence-based interventions	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Use electronic data collection tools (e.g., PDAs)	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Use the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Use the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) for Positive Behavior Support	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Graph and display student and school data	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

PS/RTI Survey 2010

9. Please rate your skill to:

Facilitate a Problem Solving Team (Student Support Team, SBLT, Child Study Team, PLC) meeting.

NS MnS SS HS VHS

ATTACHMENT C

PS/RtI Survey

PS/RTI Survey 2010

1. Introduction

The following Problem Solving - Response to Instruction /Intervention (PS/RtI) survey represents an opportunity for you to provide information which will be used by the District to create relevant Professional Development.

Your responses are also important to your School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) to assist them in providing school based training.

We value your opinion and appreciate your time. Thank you!

2. PS/RtI Beliefs: General Information

* 1. Job description:

School Administrator (Principal/Assistant Principal)

Teacher - General Education

Teacher - ESE

ESE - Other

Instructional - Non-Classroom

School Counselor

Psychological Services

School Social Worker

Occupational/Physical Therapist

Speech Therapist

Reading/Literacy Coach

Math/Science Coach

Media Specialist

PS/RTI Coach

None of the above

3. PS/RtI Beliefs: General Information

* 1. Years of Experience in Education:

Less than 1 year

1-4 years

5-9 years

10-14 years

15-19 years

20-24 years

25 or more years

2. Participation in PS / RtI Training:

Please mark ALL that apply:

- Participated in District SBLT Training
- PS/RTI Training delivered through school based PLC's
- PS/RTI Presentation in Faculty Meetings
- State PS/RtI online Moodle course
- Training on Moodle
- Other trainings on PS/RTI

* 3. I work in more than one school.

Yes

No

4. School Assignment

* 1. I work at:

* 2. Are you on the School Based Leadership Team?

Yes

No

5. School Assignments

1. Please choose the schools you work at:

	School #1	School #2	School #3	School #4
Schools:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

* 2. Are you on the School Based Leadership Team?

Yes

No

3. Comments:

PS/RTI Survey 2010

8. PS/RtI Beliefs

If you do not have a response to any part of the following questions, please leave it blank.

1. Using the following scale, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements that best represents your response.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I believe in the philosophy of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) even if I disagree with some of the requirements.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Core instruction should be effective enough to result in 80% of the students achieving benchmarks in reading	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Core instruction should be effective enough to result in 80% of the students achieving benchmarks in math	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The primary function of supplemental instruction is to ensure that students meet grade-level benchmarks in reading	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The primary function of supplemental instruction is to ensure that students meet grade-level benchmarks in math	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The majority of students identified as students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The majority of students identified as students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in math	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The majority of students identified with emotional behavioral disabilities (EBD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in reading	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The majority of students identified with emotional behavioral disabilities (EBD) achieve grade-level benchmarks in math	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Students with high-incidence disabilities (e.g., Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Behavioral Disabilities, Other Health Impaired) who are receiving exceptional student education services are capable of achieving grade-level benchmarks (i.e., general education standards) in reading	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Students with high-incidence disabilities (e.g., Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Behavioral Disabilities, Other Health Impaired) who are receiving exceptional student education services are capable of achieving grade-level benchmarks (i.e., general education standards) in math	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
General education classroom teachers should implement more differentiated and flexible instructional practices to address the needs of a more diverse student body.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
General education classroom teachers would be able to implement more differentiated and flexible interventions if they had additional staff support.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The use of additional interventions in the general education classroom would result in success for more students.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
Prevention activities and early intervention strategies in schools would result in fewer referrals to problem-solving teams and placements in special education.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The "severity" of a student's academic problem is determined not by how far behind the student is in terms of his/her academic performance but by how quickly the student responds to intervention.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The "severity" of a student's behavioral problem is determined not by how inappropriate a student is in terms of his/her behavioral	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

PS/RTI Survey 2010

performance but by how quickly the student responds to intervention. The results of IQ and achievement testing can be used to identify effective interventions for students with learning and behavior problems.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
Many students currently identified as "Specific Learning Disabled" do not have a disability, rather they came to school "not ready" to learn or fell too far behind academically for the available interventions to close the gap sufficiently.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
Using student-based data to determine intervention effectiveness is more accurate than using only "teacher judgment."	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
Evaluating a student's response to interventions is a more effective way of determining what a student is capable of achieving than using scores from "tests" (e.g., IQ/Achievement test).	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
Additional time and resources should be allocated first to students who are not reaching benchmarks (i.e., general education standards) before significant time and resources are directed to students who are at or above benchmarks.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
Graphing student data makes it easier for one to make decisions about student performance and needed interventions.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
A student's parents (guardian) should be involved in the problem-solving process as soon as a teacher has a concern about the student.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
Students respond better to interventions when their parent (guardian) is involved in the development and implementation of those interventions.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
All students can achieve grade-level benchmarks if they have sufficient support.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn
The goal of assessment is to generate and measure effectiveness of instruction/intervention.	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn	Jn

9. Thank You

Thank you for your time in answering this survey. Your feedback is appreciated. Please click "Done" below to finish the survey.