

# **Appendix M**

---

## **Survey Results by School Level**

## East Valley – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### East Valley – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	73	41	12	N
	Years as an educator	16.03 9.2 (1-36)	15.78 9.3 (3-35)	15.23 11 (1.5-31)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	11.11 8.2 (1-29)	9.88 8.6 (1-31)	9.41 7.9 (1.5-27)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	9.68 8.4 (1-31)	9.63 8.2 (1-31)	6.86 5 (1.5-18)	

## East Valley – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	16.4% (12)	4.9% (2)	0	N %
	Associate's Degree	8.2% (6)	4.9% (2)	0	
	Bachelor's Degree	24.7% (18)	17.1% (7)	16.7% (2)	
	Master's Degree	47.9% (35)	73.2% (30)	75.0% (9)	
	Doctorate	0	0	0	
	Other	8.2% (6)	2.4% (1)	8.3% (1)	

Highly Qualified?	65.8%	87.8%	83.3%	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	15.1%	17.1%	16.7%	
Other Certification	54.8%	61.0%	33.3%	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	90.4% (66)	68.3% (28)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	Mathematics	79.5% (58)	58.5% (24)	41.7% (5)	
	Science	54.8% (40)	36.6% (15)	16.7% (2)	
	Social Studies	58.9% (43)	48.8% (20)	8.3% (1)	
	Behavior	57.5% (42)	31.7% (13)	8.3% (1)	
	Written Language	56.2% (41)	61.0% (25)	8.3% (1)	
	Other	24.7% (18)	14.6% (6)	41.7% (5)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	64.4% (47)	80.5% (33)	75.0% (9)	% (N)
	Tier II	76.7% (56)	53.7% (22)	66.7% (8)	
	Tier III	34.2% (25)	31.7% (13)	33.3% (4)	
	Accelerated	6.8% (5)	7.3% (3)	33.3% (4)	
	Other	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	25.0% (3)	

## East Valley – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Content Area Implemented	Reading	75.3% (55)	56.1% (23)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	Mathematics	49.3% (36)	41.5% (17)	33.3% (4)	
	Science	5.5% (4)	19.5% (8)	8.3% (1)	
	Social Studies	12.3% (9)	29.3% (12)	0	
	Behavior	32.9% (24)	19.5% (8)	25.0% (3)	
	Written Language	20.5% (15)	43.9% (18)	16.7% (2)	
	Other	4.1% (3)	4.9% (2)	25.0% (3)	

Intervention Provider	Classroom teacher	68.5% (50)	80.5% (33)	50.0% (6)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	58.9% (43)	39.0% (16)	16.7% (2)	
	Paraprofessional	54.8% (40)	14.6% (6)	25.0% (3)	
	Parent Volunteer	21.9% (16)	2.4% (1)	0	
	Research Staff	6.8% (5)	2.4% (1)	0	
	Other	8.2% (6)	2.4% (1)	8.3% (1)	

Level of RTI Implementation	0 – None/Don't know	5.5% (4)	22.0% (9)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	23.3% (17)	31.7% (13)	50.0% (6)	
	2 – Installation	4.1% (3)	2.4% (1)	0	
	3 – Initial Implementation	15.1% (11)	17.1% (7)	8.3% (1)	
	4 – Full Implementation	17.8% (13)	9.8% (4)	8.3% (1)	
	5 – Innovation	19.2% (14)	4.9% (2)	0	
	6 - Sustainability	12.3% (9)	2.4% (1)	0	

## East Valley – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	11% (8)	24.4% (10)	33.3% (4)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	26% (19)	34.1% (14)	33.3% (4)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	20.5% (15)	12.2% (5)	0	
	4 – Partial Definition	26% (19)	19.5% (8)	16.7% (2)	
	5 – Full Definition	16.4% (12)	9.8% (4)	16.7% (2)	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	15.1% (11)	26.8% (11)	33.3% (4)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	5.5% (4)	24.4% (10)	25% (3)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	23.3% (17)	24.4% (10)	16.7% (2)	
	4 – Partial Definition	41.1% (30)	19.5% (8)	16.7% (2)	
	5 – Full Definition	15.1% (11)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	

### East Valley – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	11.0% (8)	24.4% (10)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	0	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	6.8% (5)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	31.5% (23)	12.2% (5)	0	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	42.5% (31)	22.0% (9)	16.7% (2)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	13.7% (10)	24.4% (10)	16.7% (2)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	17.8% (13)	24.4% (10)	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	16.4% (12)	14.6% (6)	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	6.8% (5)	7.3% (3)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	19.2% (14)	4.9% (2)	16.7% (2)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	21.9% (16)	39.0% (16)	16.7% (2)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	20.5% (15)	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	6.8% (5)	14.6% (6)	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	8.2% (6)	7.3% (3)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	13.7% (10)	7.3% (3)	8.3% (1)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	20.5% (15)	36.6% (15)	16.7% (2)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	17.8% (13)	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	32.9% (24)	24.4% (10)	25.0% (3)	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	4.1% (3)	2.4% (1)	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	0	2.4% (1)	0	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	11.0% (8)	17.1% (7)	0	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	43.8% (32)	24.4% (10)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	17.8% (13)	24.4% (10)	16.7% (2)	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	5.5% (4)	7.3% (3)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	4.1% (3)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	

## East Valley – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	34.2% (25)	61.0% (25)	41.7% (5)	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	42.5% (31)	14.6% (6)	16.7% (2)	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	9.6% (7)	2.4% (1)	0	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	9.6% (7)	12.2% (5)	0	

## Implementation Coherence

**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	17.8% (13)	31.7% (13)	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	15.1% (11)	17.1% (7)	41.7% (5)	
	<i>3</i>	50.7% (37)	31.7% (13)	50% (6)	
	<i>4</i>	13.7% (10)	9.8% (4)	0	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	2.7% (2)	7.3% (3)	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	1.4% (1)	2.4% (1)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	2.7% (2)	19.5% (8)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>3</i>	38.4% (28)	36.6% (15)	41.7% (5)	
	<i>4</i>	31.5% (23)	19.5% (8)	41.7% (5)	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	8.2% (6)	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	5.5% (4)	17.1% (7)	8.3% (1)	
	<i>3</i>	49.3% (36)	46.3% (19)	83.3% (10)	
	<i>4</i>	15.1% (11)	9.8% (4)	0	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	17.8% (13)	24.4% (10)	16.7% (2)	% (N)
	1	2.7% (2)	0	16.7% (2)	
	2	9.6% (7)	14.6% (6)	8.3% (1)	
	3	52.1% (38)	41.5% (17)	58.3% (7)	
	4	16.4% (12)	14.6% (6)	0	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	20.5% (15)	34.1% (14)	16.7% (2)	% (N)
	1	2.7% (2)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	2	15.1% (11)	2.4% (1)	16.7% (2)	
	3	46.6% (34)	41.5% (17)	50% (6)	
	4	13.7% (10)	4.9% (2)	0	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	6.8% (5)	7.3% (3)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	25% (3)	
	2	9.6% (7)	17.1% (7)	25% (3)	
	3	24.7% (18)	31.7% (13)	50% (6)	
	4	35.6% (26)	24.4% (10)	0	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	6.8% (5)	7.3% (3)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	8.3% (1)	
	2	4.1% (3)	12.2% (5)	25% (3)	
	3	45.2% (33)	34.1% (14)	66.7% (8)	
	4	19.2% (14)	22% (9)	0	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	4.1% (3)	4.9% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	2.4% (1)	8.3% (1)	
	3	39.7% (29)	41.5% (17)	66.7% (8)	
	4	46.6% (34)	43.9% (18)	25% (3)	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	9.6% (7)	9.8% (4)	25% (3)	% (N)
	1	5.5% (4)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	6.8% (5)	14.6% (6)	0	
	3	20.5% (15)	29.3% (12)	66.7% (8)	
	4	57.5% (42)	34.1% (14)	8.3% (1)	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	8.2% (6)	7.3% (3)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	2.7% (2)	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	4.1% (3)	9.8% (4)	25% (3)	
	3	38.4% (28)	43.9% (18)	58.3% (7)	
	4	45.2% (33)	31.7% (13)	8.3% (1)	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	4.1% (3)	14.6% (6)		% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	4.1% (3)	12.2% (5)	33.3% (4)	
	3	42.5% (31)	34.1% (14)	66.7% (8)	
	4	35.6% (26)	29.3% (12)	0	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	6.8% (5)	12.2% (5)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	5.5% (4)	19.5% (8)	41.7% (5)	
	3	56.2% (41)	41.5% (17)	58.3% (7)	
	4	27.4% (20)	19.5% (8)	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	13.7% (10)	14.6% (6)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	17.1% (7)	16.7% (2)	
	3	46.6% (34)	43.9% (18)	83.3% (10)	
	4	35.6% (26)	19.5% (8)	0	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	16.4% (12)	19.5% (8)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	2	12.3% (9)	31.7% (13)	33.3% (4)	
	3	49.3% (36)	29.3% (12)	50% (6)	
	4	17.8% (13)	7.3% (3)	0	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	16.4% (12)	17.1% (7)	25% (3)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	2.7% (2)	22% (9)	25% (3)	
	3	52.1% (38)	41.5% (17)	41.7% (5)	
	4	24.7% (18)	7.3% (3)	0	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	17.8% (13)	26.8% (11)	25% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	9.8% (4)	16.7% (2)	
	3	34.2% (25)	29.3% (12)	41.7% (5)	
	4	19.2% (14)	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	2.7% (2)	12.2% (5)	16.7% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	4.1% (3)	4.9% (2)	0	
	3	42.5% (31)	46.3% (19)	75% (9)	
	4	23.3% (17)	17.1% (7)	0	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	2.7% (2)	7.3% (3)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	2.7% (2)	4.9% (2)	0	
	3	38.4% (28)	41.5% (17)	66.7% (8)	
	4	30.1% (22)	26.8% (11)	25% (3)	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	6.8% (5)	9.8% (4)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	1.4% (1)	2.4% (1)	0	
	3	34.2% (25)	43.9% (18)	75% (9)	
	4	31.5% (23)	26.8% (11)	16.7% (2)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	21.9% (16)	51.2% (21)	41.7% (5)	% (N)
	1	0	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	6.8% (5)	9.8% (4)	16.7% (2)	
	3	54.8% (40)	14.6% (6)	33.3% (4)	
	4	13.7% (10)	9.8% (4)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	28.8% (21)	53.7% (22)	33.3% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	2.4% (1)	16.7% (2)	
	3	43.8% (32)	19.5% (8)	41.7% (5)	
	4	19.2% (14)	4.9% (2)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	13.7% (10)	51.2% (21)	50% (6)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	2.4% (1)	16.7% (2)	
	3	60.3% (44)	19.5% (8)	16.7% (2)	
	4	15.1% (11)	9.8% (4)	8.3% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	15.1% (11)	53.7% (22)	50% (6)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	4.1% (3)	2.4% (1)	16.7% (2)	
	3	54.8% (40)	17.1% (7)	25% (3)	
	4	23.3% (17)	9.8% (4)	0	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	24.7% (18)	61% (25)	50% (6)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	9.8% (4)	0	
	2	12.3% (9)	0	25% (3)	
	3	45.2% (33)	7.3% (3)	16.7% (2)	
	4	13.7% (10)	12.2% (5)	0	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	35.6% (26)	61% (25)	50% (6)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	4.9% (2)	16.7% (2)	
	3	43.8% (32)	7.3% (3)	25% (3)	
	4	6.8% (5)	2.4% (1)	0	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	12.3% (9)	17.1% (7)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	12.3% (9)	9.8% (4)	25% (3)	
	3	56.2% (41)	46.3% (19)	58.3% (7)	
	4	13.7% (10)	9.8% (4)	0	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	12.3% (9)	14.6% (6)	16.7% (2)	% (N)
	1	5.5% (4)	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	4.9% (2)	25% (3)	
	3	31.5% (23)	46.3% (19)	50% (6)	
	4	19.2% (14)	12.2% (5)	0	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	20.5% (15)	51.2% (21)	16.7% (2)	% (N)
	1	4.1% (3)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	13.7% (10)	2.4% (1)	41.7% (5)	
	3	27.4% (20)	19.5% (8)	33.3% (4)	
	4	11% (8)	2.4% (1)	0	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	13.7% (10)	48.8% (20)	25% (3)	% (N)
	1	5.5% (4)	7.3% (3)	8.3% (1)	
	2	9.6% (7)	7.3% (3)	41.7% (5)	
	3	35.6% (26)	19.5% (8)	16.7% (2)	
	4	9.6% (7)	2.4% (1)	0	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	26% (19)	43.9% (18)	33.3% (4)	% (N)
	1	5.5% (4)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	9.6% (7)	17.1% (7)	33.3% (4)	
	3	37% (27)	14.6% (6)	25% (3)	
	4	20.5% (15)	7.3% (3)	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	1.4% (1)	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	1.4% (1)	0	0	
	3	43.8% (32)	43.9% (18)	58.3% (7)	
	4	47.9% (35)	34.1% (14)	25% (3)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	11% (8)	22% (9)	0	% (N)
	1	0	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	13.7% (10)	14.6% (6)	33.3% (4)	
	3	46.6% (34)	36.6% (15)	41.7% (5)	
	4	26% (19)	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	1.4% (1)	9.8% (4)	0	% (N)
	1	0	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	1.4% (1)	0	8.3% (1)	
	3	39.7% (29)	39% (16)	58.3% (7)	
	4	56.2% (41)	39% (16)	25% (3)	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	5.5% (4)	19.5% (8)	0	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	15.1% (11)	9.8% (4)	16.7% (2)	
	3	41.1% (30)	43.9% (18)	66.7% (8)	
	4	35.6% (26)	14.6% (6)	8.3% (1)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	28.8% (21)	51.2% (21)	41.7% (5)	% (N)
	1	2.7% (2)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	8.2% (6)	2.4% (1)	25% (3)	
	3	38.4% (28)	22% (9)	16.7% (2)	
	4	20.5% (15)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	16.4% (12)	48.8% (20)	25% (3)	% (N)
	1	4.1% (3)	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	6.8% (5)	2.4% (1)	16.7% (2)	
	3	45.2% (33)	19.5% (8)	50% (6)	
	4	24.7% (18)	12.2% (5)	0	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	20.5% (15)	56.1% (23)	33.3% (4)	% (N)
	1	2.7% (2)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	2	9.6% (7)	2.4% (1)	16.7% (2)	
	3	41.1% (30)	14.6% (6)	33.3% (4)	
	4	20.5% (15)	9.8% (4)	0	

### East Valley – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	35.6% (26)	63.4% (26)	50% (6)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.3% (3)	0	
	2	9.6% (7)	0	16.7% (2)	
	3	37% (27)	14.6% (6)	25% (3)	
	4	15.1% (11)	2.4% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	57.5% (42)	68.3% (28)	58.3% (7)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	15.1% (11)	4.9% (2)	8.3% (1)	
	3	20.5% (15)	9.8% (4)	25% (3)	
	4	1.4% (1)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	50.7% (37)	68.3% (28)	66.7% (8)	% (N)
	1	0	4.9% (2)	0	
	2	15.1% (11)	2.4% (1)	8.3% (1)	
	3	20.5% (15)	12.2% (5)	16.7% (2)	
	4	8.2% (6)	0	0	

**East Valley – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	2.7% (2)	17.1% (7)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	2	47.9% (35)	17.1% (7)	25% (3)	
	3	43.8% (32)	31.7% (13)	41.7% (5)	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	2.7% (2)	17.1% (7)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	2	52.1% (38)	22% (9)	8.3% (1)	
	3	37% (27)	26.8% (11)	58.3% (7)	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	0	14.6% (6)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	2	31.5% (23)	17.1% (7)	16.7% (2)	
	3	57.5% (42)	34.1% (14)	50% (6)	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	0	12.2% (5)	8.3% (1)	% (N)
	2	42.5% (31)	22% (9)	8.3% (1)	
	3	46.6% (34)	31.7% (13)	58.3% (7)	

## Hoquiam – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### Hoquiam – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	44.0	13	14	N
	Years as an educator	15.28 10.6 (1-43)	18.77 11.6 (3-35)	19 13 (5-43)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	9.49 8.7 (1-28)	11.23 9.1 (2-32)	10.79 11.8 (2-35)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	8.29 8.9 (1-43)	10.85 9.4 (2-32)	12.23 12.4 (2-35)	

## Hoquiam – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	20.5% (9)	0	0	N %
	Associate's Degree	2.3% (1)	0	0	
	Bachelor's Degree	36.4% (16)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	
	Master's Degree	38.6% (17)	61.5% (8)	78.6% (11)	
	Doctorate	0	0	0	
	Other	11.4% (5)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	

Highly Qualified?	65.9% (29)	92.3% (12)	57.1% (8)	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	18.2% (8)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
Other Certification	31.8% (14)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	90.9% (40)	61.5% (8)	35.7% (5)	% (N)
	Mathematics	84.1% (37)	53.8% (7)	28.6% (4)	
	Science	54.5% (24)	53.8% (7)	28.6% (4)	
	Social Studies	54.5% (24)	61.5% (8)	14.3% (2)	
	Behavior	79.5% (35)	15.4% (2)	35.7% (5)	
	Written Language	63.6% (28)	46.2% (6)	35.7% (5)	
	Other	20.5% (9)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	75% (33)	92.3% (12)	64.3% (9)	% (N)
	Tier II	59.1% (26)	15.4% (2)	21.4% (3)	
	Tier III	50% (22)	0	14.3% (2)	
	Accelerated	4.5% (2)	0	0	
	Other	0	0	0	

## Hoquiam – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Implemented</b>	Reading	84.1% (37)	61.5% (8)	35.7% (5)	% (N)
	Mathematics	52.3% (23)	38.5% (5)	28.6% (4)	
	Science	9.1% (4)	0	14.3% (2)	
	Social Studies	6.8% (3)	15.4% (2)	14.3% (2)	
	Behavior	40.9% (18)	7.7% (1)	35.7% (5)	
	Written Language	13.6% (6)	0	28.6% (4)	
	Other	0	0	0	

<b>Intervention Provider</b>	Classroom teacher	77.3% (34)	84.6% (11)	85.7% (12)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	40.9% (18)	46.2% (6)	21.4% (3)	
	Paraprofessional	70.5% (31)	38.5% (5)	14.3% (2)	
	Parent Volunteer	4.5% (2)	0	0	
	Research Staff	0	0	0	
	Other	4.5% (2)	0	0	

<b>Level of RTI Implementation</b>	0 – None/Don't know	4.5% (2)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	11.4% (5)	46.2% (6)	50% (7)	
	2 – Installation	9.1% (4)	0	14.3% (2)	
	3 – Initial Implementation	13.6% (6)	0	0	
	4 – Full Implementation	31.8% (14)	0	14.3% (2)	
	5 – Innovation	18.2% (8)	0	0	
	6 - Sustainability	11.4% (5)	23.1% (3)	0	

## Hoquiam – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	13.6% (6)	15.4% (2)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	35.7% (5)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	20.5% (9)	30.8% (4)	7.1% (1)	
	4 – Partial Definition	27.3% (12)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	5 – Full Definition	34.1% (15)	30.8% (4)	14.3% (2)	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	9.1% (4)	30.8% (4)	35.7% (5)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	9.1% (4)	15.4% (2)	28.6% (4)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	22.7% (10)	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
	4 – Partial Definition	47.7% (21)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	
	5 – Full Definition	11.4% (5)	0	0	

## Hoquiam – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	9.1% (4)	15.4% (2)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	0	23.1% (3)	28.6% (4)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	52.3% (23)	38.5% (5)	0	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	27.3% (12)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	9.1% (4)	15.4% (2)	42.9% (6)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	0	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	6.8% (3)	0	7.1% (1)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	68.2% (30)	30.8% (4)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	6.8% (3)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	11.4% (5)	30.8% (4)	85.7% (12)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	6.8% (3)	0	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	36.4% (16)	23.1% (3)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	34.1% (15)	23.1% (3)	7.1% (1)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	11.4% (5)	23.1% (3)	71.4% (10)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	2.3% (1)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	61.4% (27)	38.5% (5)	0	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	9.1% (4)	23.1% (3)	50% (7)	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	13.6% (6)	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	40.9% (18)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	20.5% (9)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	

### Hoquiam – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	18.2% (8)	15.4% (2)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	45.5% (20)	46.2% (6)	50% (7)	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	20.5% (9)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	13.6% (6)	7.7% (1)	0	

### Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	20.5% (9)	0	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	<i>2</i>	2.3% (1)	15.4% (2)	35.7% (5)	
	<i>3</i>	31.8% (14)	61.5% (8)	28.6% (4)	
	<i>4</i>	45.5% (20)	15.4% (2)	0	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	0	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	2.3% (1)	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	0	0	21.4% (3)	
	<i>3</i>	25% (11)	53.8% (7)	57.1% (8)	
	<i>4</i>	70.5% (31)	46.2% (6)	14.3% (2)	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	6.8% (3)	0	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	<i>2</i>	11.4% (5)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	<i>3</i>	61.4% (27)	76.9% (10)	42.9% (6)	
	<i>4</i>	13.6% (6)	0	7.1% (1)	

### Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	35.7% (5)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	23.1% (3)	0	
	2	15.9% (7)	7.7% (1)	21.4% (3)	
	3	56.8% (25)	61.5% (8)	28.6% (4)	
	4	18.2% (8)	0	0	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	6.8% (3)	23.1% (3)	7.1% (1)	
	2	13.6% (6)	15.4% (2)	14.3% (2)	
	3	47.7% (21)	46.2% (6)	28.6% (4)	
	4	25% (11)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	2.3% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (4)	30.8% (4)	7.1% (1)	
	2	15.9% (7)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	3	34.1% (15)	38.5% (5)	57.1% (8)	
	4	34.1% (15)	15.4% (2)	21.4% (3)	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	2.3% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	2	4.5% (2)	15.4% (2)	14.3% (2)	
	3	45.5% (20)	69.2% (9)	64.3% (9)	
	4	45.5% (20)	7.7% (1)	0	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	9.1% (4)	
	2	9.1% (4)	23.1% (3)	47.7% (21)	
	3	47.7% (21)	53.8% (7)	43.2% (19)	
	4	43.2% (19)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	

### Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	6.8% (3)	0	7.1% (1)	% (N)
	1	13.6% (6)	15.4% (2)	14.3% (2)	
	2	22.7% (10)	15.4% (2)	0	
	3	25% (11)	38.5% (5)	57.1% (8)	
	4	29.5% (13)	30.8% (4)	14.3% (2)	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	7.1% (1)	
	2	11.4% (5)	30.8% (4)	0	
	3	59.1% (26)	46.2% (6)	71.4% (10)	
	4	27.3% (12)	23.1% (3)	7.1% (1)	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	0	0	14.3% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	2	6.8% (3)	15.4% (2)	28.6% (4)	
	3	50% (22)	38.5% (5)	42.9% (6)	
	4	43.2% (19)	38.5% (5)	0	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	21.4% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	15.4% (2)	0	
	2	11.4% (5)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	3	59.1% (26)	46.2% (6)	57.1% (8)	
	4	22.7% (10)	7.7% (1)	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	0	0	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	2	0	15.4% (2)	14.3% (2)	
	3	36.4% (16)	61.5% (8)	35.7% (5)	
	4	61.4% (27)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	

**Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	15.4% (2)	0	
	2	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	28.6% (4)	
	3	50% (22)	46.2% (6)	35.7% (5)	
	4	34.1% (15)	15.4% (2)	0	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	0	7.7% (1)	50% (7)	% (N)
	1	4.5% (2)	15.4% (2)	0	
	2	4.5% (2)	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
	3	45.5% (20)	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
	4	45.5% (20)	30.8% (4)	0	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	9.1% (4)	0	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	9.1% (4)	23.1% (3)	7.1% (1)	
	2	11.4% (5)	7.7% (1)	35.7% (5)	
	3	43.2% (19)	61.5% (8)	14.3% (2)	
	4	25% (11)	0	7.1% (1)	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	2.3% (1)	0	14.3% (2)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	0	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
	3	50% (22)	38.5% (5)	35.7% (5)	
	4	40.9% (18)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	9.1% (4)	7.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	21.4% (3)	
	2	0	23.1% (3)	0	
	3	52.3% (23)	38.5% (5)	64.3% (9)	
	4	36.4% (16)	30.8% (4)	7.1% (1)	

**Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	4.5% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	
	2	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	
	3	47.7% (21)	69.2% (9)	71.4% (10)	
	4	38.6% (17)	30.8% (4)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	11.4% (5)	30.8% (4)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	1	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	4.5% (2)	15.4% (2)	35.7% (5)	
	3	54.5% (24)	38.5% (5)	14.3% (2)	
	4	20.5% (9)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	11.4% (5)	30.8% (4)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	1	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	11.4% (5)	15.4% (2)	28.6% (4)	
	3	43.2% (19)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	
	4	25% (11)	7.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	6.8% (3)	23.1% (3)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	3	47.7% (21)	38.5% (5)	35.7% (5)	
	4	36.4% (16)	15.4% (2)	0	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	9.1% (4)	15.4% (2)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	4.5% (2)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	
	3	59.1% (26)	15.4% (2)	28.6% (4)	
	4	25% (11)	30.8% (4)	7.1% (1)	

**Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	13.6% (6)	15.4% (2)	35.7% (5)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	9.1% (4)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	3	43.2% (19)	30.8% (4)	28.6% (4)	
	4	27.3% (12)	30.8% (4)	0	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	27.3% (12)	38.5% (5)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	11.4% (5)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	3	43.2% (19)	23.1% (3)	35.7% (5)	
	4	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	6.8% (3)	0	14.3% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	2	13.6% (6)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	
	3	61.4% (27)	46.2% (6)	50% (7)	
	4	15.9% (7)	15.4% (2)	0	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	2	13.6% (6)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	
	3	56.8% (25)	53.8% (7)	57.1% (8)	
	4	20.5% (9)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	4.5% (2)	15.4% (2)	21.4% (3)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	11.4% (5)	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
	3	59.1% (26)	38.5% (5)	50% (7)	
	4	15.9% (7)	7.7% (1)	0	

**Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	9.1% (4)	15.4% (2)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	21.4% (3)	
	2	4.5% (2)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	
	3	61.4% (27)	38.5% (5)	21.4% (3)	
	4	18.2% (8)	0	0	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	18.2% (8)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	6.8% (3)	23.1% (3)	35.7% (5)	
	3	54.5% (24)	53.8% (7)	42.9% (6)	
	4	18.2% (8)	15.4% (2)	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	6.8% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	0	7.1% (1)	
	2	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	3	50% (22)	69.2% (9)	50% (7)	
	4	29.5% (13)	23.1% (3)	21.4% (3)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	18.2% (8)	30.8% (4)	14.3% (2)	
	3	47.7% (21)	53.8% (7)	42.9% (6)	
	4	20.5% (9)	0	7.1% (1)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	7.1% (1)	
	2	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	3	50% (22)	46.2% (6)	42.9% (6)	
	4	43.2% (19)	46.2% (6)	42.9% (6)	

**Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	9.1% (4)	0	14.3% (2)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	15.4% (2)	7.1% (1)	
	2	18.2% (8)	30.8% (4)	14.3% (2)	
	3	45.5% (20)	46.2% (6)	50% (7)	
	4	20.5% (9)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	11.4% (5)	23.1% (3)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	2	15.9% (7)	30.8% (4)	28.6% (4)	
	3	56.8% (25)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	
	4	13.6% (6)	7.7% (1)	0	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	2.3% (1)	15.4% (2)	42.9% (6)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	2	2.3% (1)	38.5% (5)	28.6% (4)	
	3	59.1% (26)	30.8% (4)	14.3% (2)	
	4	29.5% (13)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	6.8% (3)	7.7% (1)	28.6% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	2.3% (1)	30.8% (4)	21.4% (3)	
	3	65.9% (29)	38.5% (5)	28.6% (4)	
	4	20.5% (9)	0	0	

**Hoquiam – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	27.3% (12)	38.5% (5)	64.3% (9)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	2.3% (1)	23.1% (3)	14.3% (2)	
	3	47.7% (21)	15.4% (2)	14.3% (2)	
	4	20.5% (9)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	56.8% (25)	53.8% (7)	71.4% (10)	% (N)
	1	0	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	4.5% (2)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	3	22.7% (10)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	4	13.6% (6)	7.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	63.6% (28)	61.5% (8)	71.4% (10)	% (N)
	1	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	0	
	2	2.3% (1)	7.7% (1)	7.1% (1)	
	3	15.9% (7)	7.7% (1)	14.3% (2)	
	4	13.6% (6)	0	0	

**Hoquiam – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	61.4% (27)	23.1% (3)	0	% (N)
	2	34.1% (15)	76.9% (10)	85.7% (12)	
	3	2.3% (1)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	79.5% (35)	38.5% (5)	0	% (N)
	2	18.2% (8)	61.5% (8)	85.7% (12)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	50% (22)	23.1% (3)	7.1% (1)	% (N)
	2	40.9% (18)	76.9% (10)	78.6% (11)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	68.2% (30)	23.1% (3)	7.1% (1)	% (N)
	2	25% (11)	76.9% (10)	71.4% (10)	
	3	0	0	7.1% (1)	

## Kiona Benton – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### Kiona Benton – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	13.0	6.0	7.0	N
	Years as an educator	16.29 9.1 (4-30)	12.4 3.6 (9-17)	19.25 10.5 (10-39)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	12.21 9 (2-30)	10.4 4.2 (7-17)	12.43 13 (1-39)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	7.36 6.4 (1-19)	7.83 6.1 (3-20)	17.93 9.7 (10-39)	

## Kiona Benton – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	7.7% (1)	0	0	N %
	Associate's Degree	0	0	0	
	Bachelor's Degree	46.2% (6)	16.7% (1)	57.1% (4)	
	Master's Degree	46.2% (6)	83.3% (5)	42.9% (3)	
	Doctorate	0	0	0	
	Other	0	0	0	

Highly Qualified?	92.3% (12)	83.3% (5)	100% (7)	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
Other Certification	84.6% (11)	100% (6)	100% (7)	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	100% (13)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	Mathematics	92.3% (12)	83.3% (5)	42.9% (3)	
	Science	84.6% (11)	66.7% (4)	14.3% (1)	
	Social Studies	84.6% (11)	50% (3)	42.9% (3)	
	Behavior	84.6% (11)	0	14.3% (1)	
	Written Language	100% (13)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	Other	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	92.3% (12)	100% (6)	71.4% (5)	% (N)
	Tier II	61.5% (8)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	Tier III	30.8% (4)	33.3% (2)	14.3% (1)	
	Accelerated	92.3% (12)	100% (6)	71.4% (5)	
	Other	0	0	0	

## Kiona Benton – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Content Area Implemented	Reading	100% (13)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	% (N)
	Mathematics	69.2% (9)	66.7% (4)	57.1% (4)	
	Science	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
	Social Studies	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	
	Behavior	23.1% (3)	0	28.6% (2)	
	Written Language	38.5% (5)	0	42.9% (3)	
	Other	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	

Intervention Provider	Classroom teacher	76.9% (10)	100% (6)	85.7% (6)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	53.8% (7)	0	28.6% (2)	
	Paraprofessional	53.8% (7)	0	28.6% (2)	
	Parent Volunteer	15.4% (2)	0	0	
	Research Staff	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	Other	0	0	28.6% (2)	

Level of RTI Implementation	0 – None/Don't know	0	0	0	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	46.2% (6)	50% (3)	57.1% (4)	
	2 – Installation	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	3 – Initial Implementation	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	4 – Full Implementation	7.7% (1)	0	0	
	5 – Innovation	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
	6 - Sustainability	0	0	0	

## Kiona Benton – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	4 – Partial Definition	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	
	5 – Full Definition	15.4% (2)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	7.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	53.8% (7)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4 – Partial Definition	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	5 – Full Definition	0	0	0	

### Kiona Benton – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	0	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	46.2% (6)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	30.8% (4)	50% (3)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	30.8% (4)	0	28.6% (2)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	0	0	28.6% (2)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	53.8% (7)	66.7% (4)	42.9% (3)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	7.7% (1)	0	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	0	0	28.6% (2)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	23.1% (3)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	0	0	0	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	15.4% (2)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	38.5% (5)	0	28.6% (2)	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	15.4% (2)	0	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	0	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	

### Kiona Benton – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	15.4% (2)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	23.1% (3)	0	28.6% (2)	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	46.2% (6)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>3</i>	15.4% (2)	50% (3)	42.9% (3)	
	<i>4</i>	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	0	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	15.4% (2)	33.3% (2)	0	
	<i>3</i>	38.5% (5)	16.7% (1)	85.7% (6)	
	<i>4</i>	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	0	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	0	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>3</i>	46.2% (6)	50% (3)	28.6% (2)	
	<i>4</i>	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	0	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	30.8% (4)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	15.4% (2)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	3	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	4	15.4% (2)	0	0	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	0	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	23.1% (3)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	15.4% (2)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	3	46.2% (6)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	4	15.4% (2)	0	0	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	3	61.5% (8)	66.7% (4)	57.1% (4)	
	4	15.4% (2)	0	0	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	0	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	28.6% (2)	
	2	30.8% (4)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	38.5% (5)	50% (3)	42.9% (3)	
	4	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	0	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	0	0	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	15.4% (2)	0	0	
	3	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	57.1% (4)	
	4	69.2% (9)	66.7% (4)	28.6% (2)	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	0	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	53.8% (7)	33.3% (2)	0	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	0	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	42.9% (3)	
	3	38.5% (5)	66.7% (4)	42.9% (3)	
	4	53.8% (7)	0	0	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	30.8% (4)	50% (3)	42.9% (3)	
	3	61.5% (8)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	
	4	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	0	0	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	3	53.8% (7)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	
	4	7.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	0	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	53.8% (7)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	3	15.4% (2)	0	57.1% (4)	
	4	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	53.8% (7)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	3	38.5% (5)	16.7% (1)	57.1% (4)	
	4	0	0	0	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	7.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	38.5% (5)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	3	46.2% (6)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	7.7% (1)	0	0	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	30.8% (4)	50% (3)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	38.5% (5)	0	42.9% (3)	
	3	23.1% (3)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	7.7% (1)	0	0	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	7.7% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	53.8% (7)	66.7% (4)	85.7% (6)	
	4	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	53.8% (7)	66.7% (4)	57.1% (4)	
	4	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	0	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	0	0	28.6% (2)	
	3	61.5% (8)	50% (3)	42.9% (3)	
	4	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	23.1% (3)	0	0	
	2	15.4% (2)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	3	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	4	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	42.9% (3)	% (N)
	1	23.1% (3)	0	0	
	2	23.1% (3)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	3	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	4	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	23.1% (3)	50% (3)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	7.7% (1)	0	0	
	2	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	57.1% (4)	
	3	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	4	7.7% (1)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	2	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	3	23.1% (3)	33.3% (2)	57.1% (4)	
	4	15.4% (2)	0	0	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	46.2% (6)	50% (3)	14.3% (1)	
	3	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	4	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	53.8% (7)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	7.7% (1)	0	0	
	2	23.1% (1)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	3	15.4% (2)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
	4	0	0	14.3% (1)	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	0	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	0	0	
	2	46.2% (6)	0	28.6% (2)	
	3	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	0	33.3% (2)	0	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	0	0	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	0	0	
	2	38.5% (5)	0	71.4% (5)	
	3	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	14.3% (1)	
	4	7.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	0	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	30.8% (4)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	30.8% (4)	66.7% (4)	71.4% (5)	
	4	0	0	0	

### Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	30.8% (4)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	38.5% (5)	50% (3)	57.1% (4)	
	4	0	16.7% (1)	0	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	23.1% (3)	33.3% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	46.2% (6)	33.3% (2)	57.1% (4)	
	4	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	0	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	53.8% (7)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	7.7% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	15.4% (2)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	3	46.2% (6)	16.7% (1)	71.4% (5)	
	4	23.1% (3)	50% (3)	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	0	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	0	
	3	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	57.1% (4)	
	4	61.5% (8)	50% (3)	42.9% (3)	

**Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	0	0	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	30.8% (4)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	53.8% (7)	66.7% (4)	42.9% (3)	
	4	7.7% (1)	16.7%	14.3% (1)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	28.6% (2)	
	2	38.5% (5)	16.7% (1)	14.3% (1)	
	3	30.8% (4)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	0	16.7% (1)	0	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	30.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	3	30.8% (4)	33.3% (2)	57.1% (4)	
	4	7.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	23.1% (3)	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	46.2% (6)	66.7% (4)	42.9% (3)	
	4	0	0	0	

**Kiona Benton – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	46.2% (6)	50% (3)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	1	15.4% (2)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	30.8% (4)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	4	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	84.6% (11)	83.3% (5)	57.1% (4)	% (N)
	1	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	3	0	0	14.3% (1)	
	4	0	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	84.6% (11)	66.7% (4)	57.1% (4)	% (N)
	1	7.7% (1)	0	14.3% (1)	
	2	7.7% (1)	0	0	
	3	0	16.7% (1)	28.6% (2)	
	4	0	0	0	

**Kiona Benton – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	38.5% (5)	33.3% (2)	28.6% (2)	% (N)
	2	46.2% (6)	50% (3)	71.4% (5)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	30.8% (4)	50% (3)	57.1% (4)	% (N)
	2	61.5% (8)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	46.2% (6)	33.3% (2)	57.1% (4)	% (N)
	2	46.2% (6)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	69.2% (9)	33.3% (2)	42.9% (3)	% (N)
	2	23.1% (3)	33.3% (2)	57.1% (4)	
	3	0	0	0	

## Longview – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### Longview – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	156.0	16.0	0	N
	Years as an educator	16.63 9.9 (1-38)	17.44 10 (6-35)	0	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	9.78 7.3 (1-32)	8.75 4.7 (1-20)	0	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	7.54 6.1 (0-28)	8.19 6.1 (1-21)	0	

## Longview – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	10.9% (17)	0	0	N %
	Associate's Degree	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	Bachelor's Degree	23.7% (37)	18.8% (3)	0	
	Master's Degree	57.1% (89)	81.3% (13)	0	
	Doctorate	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	Other	5.8% (9)	0	0	

Highly Qualified?	71.8% (112)	93.8% (15)	0	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	13.5% (21)	6.3% (1)	0	
Other Certification	37.8% (59)	37.5% (6)	0	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	86.5% (135)	93.8% (15)	0	% (N)
	Mathematics	77.6% (121)	93.8% (15)	0	
	Science	60.3% (94)	87.5% (14)	0	
	Social Studies	58.3% (91)	87.5% (14)	0	
	Behavior	64.7% (101)	68.8% (11)	0	
	Written Language	67.3% (105)	87.5% (14)	0	
	Other	22.4% (35)	12.5% (2)	0	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	71.8% (112)	93.8% (15)	0	% (N)
	Tier II	59.6% (93)	68.8% (11)	0	
	Tier III	44.9% (70)	25% (4)	0	
	Accelerated	13.5% (21)	25% (4)	0	
	Other	2.6% (4)	6.3% (1)	0	

## Longview – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Content Area Implemented	Reading	78.2% (122)	81.3% (13)	0	% (N)
	Mathematics	50.6% (79)	50% (8)	0	
	Science	11.5% (18)	6.3% (1)	0	
	Social Studies	10.3% (16)	0	0	
	Behavior	31.4% (49)	37.5% (6)	0	
	Written Language	25% (39)	37.5% (6)	0	
	Other	7.1% (11)	0	0	

Intervention Provider	Classroom teacher	67.9% (106)	87.5% (14)	0	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	50.6% (79)	37.5% (6)	0	
	Paraprofessional	54.5% (85)	18.8% (3)	0	
	Parent Volunteer	24.4% (38)	12.5% (2)	0	
	Research Staff	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	Other	6.4% (10)	0	0	

Level of RTI Implementation	0 – None/Don't know	10.9% (17)	0	0	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	23.7% (37)	25% (4)	0	
	2 – Installation	12.8% (20)	12.5% (2)	0	
	3 – Initial Implementation	16% (25)	50% (8)	0	
	4 – Full Implementation	15.4% (24)	6.3% (1)	0	
	5 – Innovation	9.6% (15)	0	0	
	6 - Sustainability	3.8% (6)	0	0	

## Longview – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	11.5% (18)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	17.3% (27)	0	0	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	22.4% (35)	31.3% (5)	0	
	4 – Partial Definition	26.3% (41)	37.5% (6)	0	
	5 – Full Definition	22.4% (35)	25% (4)	0	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	9.6% (15)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	7.7% (12)	0	0	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	28.2% (44)	18.8% (3)	0	
	4 – Partial Definition	44.9% (70)	68.8% (11)	0	
	5 – Full Definition	9.6% (15)	6.3% (1)	0	

## Longview – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	5.1% (8)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	5.8% (9)	6.3% (1)	0	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	43.6% (68)	37.5% (6)	0	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	44.2% (69)	37.5% (6)	0	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	7.1% (11)	0	0	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	14.1% (22)	25% (4)	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	14.1% (22)	25% (4)	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	24.4% (38)	12.5% (2)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	19.2% (30)	25% (4)	0	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	14.7% (23)	18.8% (3)	0	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	6.4% (10)	12.5% (2)	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	10.9% (17)	12.5% (2)	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	21.2% (33)	18.8% (3)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	26.9% (42)	18.8% (3)	0	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	14.7% (23)	0	0	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	35.9% (56)	37.5% (6)	0	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	21.2% (33)	18.8% (3)	0	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	2.6% (4)	6.3% (1)	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	4.4% (7)	0	0	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	5.1% (8)	0	0	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	28.8% (45)	43.8% (7)	0	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	16.7% (26)	25% (4)	0	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	16.7% (26)	12.5% (2)	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	19.2% (30)	6.3% (1)	0	

### Longview – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	37.2% (58)	25% (4)	0	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	44.9% (70)	62.5% (10)	0	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	7.1% (11)	6.3% (1)	0	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	3.2% (5)	0	0	

### Longview – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	11.5% (18)	12.5% (2)	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	5.1% (8)	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	12.8% (20)	6.3% (1)	0	
	<i>3</i>	42.9% (67)	50% (8)	0	
	<i>4</i>	24.4% (38)	31.3% (5)	0	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	0.6% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	2.6% (4)	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	<i>3</i>	42.9% (67)	37.5% (6)	0	
	<i>4</i>	50.6% (79)	62.5% (10)	0	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	4.5% (7)	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	12.2% (19)	6.3% (1)	0	
	<i>3</i>	63.5% (99)	81.3% (13)	0	
	<i>4</i>	12.2% (19)	12.5% (2)	0	

### Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	10.3% (16)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	18.6% (29)	12.5% (2)	0	
	3	50% (78)	62.5% (10)	0	
	4	17.3% (27)	25% (4)	0	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	16.7% (26)	12.5% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	12.8% (20)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	51.3% (80)	50% (8)	0	
	4	16% (25)	31.3% (5)	0	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	3.2% (5)	0	0	% (N)
	1	2.6% (4)	0	0	
	2	6.4% (10)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	56.4% (88)	75% (12)	0	
	4	30.1% (47)	18.8% (3)	0	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	5.1% (8)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	12.8% (20)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	48.7% (76)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	29.5% (46)	25% (4)	0	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	1.9% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	5.1% (8)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	41% (64)	43.8% (7)	0	
	4	47.4% (74)	50% (8)	0	

### Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	3.2% (5)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	7.1% (11)	6.3% (1)	0	
	2	17.9% (28)	31.3% (5)	0	
	3	34% (53)	12.5% (2)	0	
	4	35.9% (56)	43.8% (7)	0	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	3.2% (5)	0	0	% (N)
	1	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	2	9.6% (15)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	48.7% (76)	43.8% (7)	0	
	4	32.7% (51)	50% (8)	0	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	2.6% (4)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	2	14.1% (22)	0	0	
	3	50% (78)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	30.1% (47)	31.3% (5)	0	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	5.1% (8)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	2	17.9% (28)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	57.1% (89)	75% (12)	0	
	4	15.4% (24)	18.8% (3)	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	3.2% (5)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	3	38.5% (60)	43.8% (7)	0	
	4	51.9% (81)	50% (8)	0	

### Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	10.3% (16)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	2	17.9% (28)	18.8% (3)	0	
	3	48.1% (75)	50% (8)	0	
	4	19.9% (31)	31.3% (5)	0	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	7.1% (11)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	7.1% (11)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	55.8% (87)	56.3% (9)	0	
	4	26.9% (42)	31.3% (5)	0	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	10.9% (17)	12.5% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	3.8% (6)	0	0	
	3	46.8% (73)	50% (8)	0	
	4	35.9% (56)	37.5% (6)	0	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	2.6% (4)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	3	50.6% (79)	50% (8)	0	
	4	41% (64)	50% (8)	0	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	3.8% (6)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	4.5% (7)	0	0	
	3	48.1% (75)	50% (8)	0	
	4	41% (64)	50% (8)	0	

**Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	5.8% (9)	0	0	% (N)
	1	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	2	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	3	42.9% (67)	37.5 (6)	0	
	4	42.3% (66)	62.5% (10)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	22.4% (35)	12.5% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	18.6% (29)	12.5% (2)	0	
	3	43.6% (68)	50% (8)	0	
	4	10.3% (16)	25% (4)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	17.9% (28)	18.8% (3)	0	% (N)
	1	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	2	20.5% (32)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	41% (64)	56.3% (9)	0	
	4	14.7% (23)	18.8% (3)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	13.5% (21)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.6% (15)	0	0	
	3	57.7% (90)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	14.1% (22)	18.8% (3)	0	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	11.5% (18)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	4.5% (7)	0	0	
	2	17.3% (27)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	45.5% (71)	62.5% (10)	0	
	4	17.3% (27)	25% (4)	0	

**Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	16% (25)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	4.5% (7)	0	0	
	2	23.7% (37)	18.8% (3)	0	
	3	35.9% (56)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	12.2% (19)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	31.4% (49)	43.8% (7)	0	% (N)
	1	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	2	12.2% (19)	0	0	
	3	39.1% (61)	50% (8)	0	
	4	10.9% (17)	6.3% (1)	0	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	4.5% (7)	0	0	% (N)
	1	2.6% (4)	0	0	
	2	9.6% (15)	0	0	
	3	60.9% (95)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	17.3% (27)	31.3% (5)	0	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	3.2% (5)	0	0	% (N)
	1	3.2% (5)	0	0	
	2	6.4% (10)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	60.9% (95)	56.3% (9)	0	
	4	21.8% (34)	37.5% (6)	0	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	17.9% (28)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	7.1% (11)	0	0	
	2	21.8% (34)	12.5% (2)	0	
	3	39.7% (62)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	7.7% (12)	12.5% (2)	0	

**Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	19.2% (30)	12.5% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	5.1% (8)	0	0	
	2	21.8% (34)	18.8% (3)	0	
	3	39.1% (61)	37.5% (6)	0	
	4	9.6% (15)	31.3% (5)	0	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	35.3% (55)	31.3% (5)	0	% (N)
	1	5.1% (8)	0	0	
	2	16% (25)	0	0	
	3	30.8% (48)	50% (8)	0	
	4	6.4% (10)	12.5% (2)	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	0.6% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	3	43.6% (68)	43.8% (7)	0	
	4	44.8% (70)	56.3% (9)	0	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	3.8% (6)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	2.6% (4)	0	0	
	2	10.3% (16)	0	0	
	3	52.6% (82)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	30% (39)	25% (4)	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	1.9% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	0.6% (1)	0	0	
	3	42.9% (67)	50% (8)	0	
	4	50% (78)	50% (8)	0	

**Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	3.2% (5)	0	0	% (N)
	1	4.5% (7)	0	0	
	2	9.6% (15)	0	0	
	3	49.4% (77)	62.5% (10)	0	
	4	29.4% (46)	37.5% (6)	0	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	27.6% (43)	12.5% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	13.5% (21)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	41% (64)	62.5% (10)	0	
	4	10.9% (17)	18.8% (3)	0	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	16% (25)	6.3% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	1.3% (2)	0	0	
	2	10.9% (17)	0	0	
	3	49.4% (77)	75% (12)	0	
	4	18.6% (29)	18.8% (3)	0	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	21.8% (34)	25% (4)	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	16% (25)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	41.7% (65)	56.3% (9)	0	
	4	13.5% (21)	12.5% (2)	0	

**Longview – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	41% (64)	18.8% (3)	0	% (N)
	1	1.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	14.1% (22)	0	0	
	3	31.4% (49)	68.8% (11)	0	
	4	7.7% (12)	12.5% (2)	0	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	58.3% (91)	68.8% (11)	0	% (N)
	1	3.8% (6)	0	0	
	2	15.4% (24)	6.3% (1)	0	
	3	16% (25)	12.5% (2)	0	
	4	1.9% (3)	12.5% (2)	0	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	60.9% (95)	75% (12)	0	% (N)
	1	2.6% (4)	0	0	
	2	11.5% (18)	0	0	
	3	17.3% (27)	18.8% (3)	0	
	4	3.2% (5)	6.3% (1)	0	

**Longview – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	29.5% (46)	43.8% (7)	0	% (N)
	2	57.7% (90)	50% (8)	0	
	3	1.9% (3)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	37.2% (58)	56.3% (9)	0	% (N)
	2	48.1% (75)	37.5% (6)	0	
	3	3.2% (5)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	42.3% (66)	37.5% (6)	0	% (N)
	2	46.8% (73)	56.3% (9)	0	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	46.2% (72)	56.3% (9)	0	% (N)
	2	37.8% (59)	37.5% (6)	0	
	3	0.6% (1)	0	0	

## Odessa – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

## Odessa – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	11.0	1.0	0	N mean s.d. (range)
	Years as an educator	9.09 6.6 (2-20)	30	0	
	Years at current school	7.27 5.5 (1-15)	20	0	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	6.18 6.2 (1-20)	4	0	

## Odessa – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	0	0	0	N %
	Associate's Degree	0	0	0	
	Bachelor's Degree	54.5% (6)	0	0	
	Master's Degree	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
	Doctorate	0	0	0	
	Other	0	0	0	

Highly Qualified?	100% (11)	100% (1)	0	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	27.3% (3)	0	0	
Other Certification	63.6% (7)	100% (1)	0	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	100% (11)	100% (1)	0	% (N)
	Mathematics	90.9% (10)	100% (1)	0	
	Science	81.8% (9)	100% (1)	0	
	Social Studies	81.8% (9)	100% (1)	0	
	Behavior	72.7% (8)	0	0	
	Written Language	90.9% (10)	100% (1)	0	
	Other	18.2% (2)	0	0	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	90.9% (10)	100% (1)	0	% (N)
	Tier II	54.5% (6)	0	0	
	Tier III	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	Accelerated	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	Other	0	100% (1)	0	

## Odessa – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Implemented</b>	Reading	100% (11)	100% (1)	0	% (N)
	Mathematics	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	Science	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	Social Studies	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	Behavior	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	Written Language	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	Other	0	0	0	

<b>Intervention Provider</b>	Classroom teacher	72.7% (8)	0	0	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	Paraprofessional	72.7% (8)	100% (1)	0	
	Parent Volunteer	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	Research Staff	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	Other	0	0	0	

<b>Level of RTI Implementation</b>	0 – None/Don't know	0	0	0	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	2 – Installation	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3 – Initial Implementation	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	4 – Full Implementation	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	5 – Innovation	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	6 - Sustainability	0	0	0	

## Odessa – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	0	0	0	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	4 – Partial Definition	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	5 – Full Definition	36.4% (4)	0	0	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	0	0	0	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	4 – Partial Definition	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	5 – Full Definition	9.1% (1)	100% (1)	0	

### Odessa – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	1 = never	0	0	0	% (N)
	2 = once	0	0	0	
	3 = twice	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	4 = three times	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	5 = more than 3 times	27.3% (3)	100% (1)	0	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	1 = never	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2 = 6 weeks	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3 = 4/5 weeks	0	0	0	
	4 = 2/3 weeks	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
	5 = weekly or more often	0	0	0	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	1 = never	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	2 = 6 weeks	0	0	0	
	3 = 4/5 weeks	0	0	0	
	4 = 2/3 weeks	9.1% (1)	100% (1)	0	
	5 = weekly or more often	45.5% (5)	0	0	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	1 = never	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2 = 1 or 2 data points	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3 = 3 to 5 data points	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	4 = 6 data points	0	0	0	
	5 = >6 data points	9.1% (1)	0	0	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	1 = never	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2 = 3 times per year	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3 = 6 weeks	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4 = monthly	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	5 = >monthly	0	0	0	

### Odessa – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	0	0	0	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	72.7% (8)	100% (1)	0	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	18.2% (2)	0	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	27.3% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>3</i>	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	<i>4</i>	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	0	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>3</i>	54.5% (6)	0	0	
	<i>4</i>	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	0	0	0	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>2</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>3</i>	63.6% (7)	100% (1)	0	
	<i>4</i>	27.3% (3)	0	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	100% (1)	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
	4	9.1% (1)	0	0	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	4	27.3% (3)	0	0	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	54.5% (6)	100% (1)	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	36.4% (4)	0	0	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	4	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	54.5% (6)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	4	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	27.3% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	4	27.3% (3)	0	0	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	27.3% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	4	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3	27.3% (3)	100% (1)	0	
	4	9.1% (1)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	27.3% (3)	100% (1)	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	9.1% (1)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	100% (1)	0	
	2	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	54.5% (6)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3	54.5% (6)	0	0	
	4	9.1% (1)	0	0	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
	4	9.1% (1)	0	0	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	3	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	4	27.3% (3)	0	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	100% (1)	0	
	3	36.4% (4)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	36.4% (4)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	27.3% (3)	100% (1)	0	
	4	9.1% (1)	0	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	4	54.5% (6)	0	0	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	3	54.5% (6)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	0	0	
	4	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	0	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3	54.5% (6)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	3	54.5% (6)	0	0	
	4	0	0	0	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	3	45.5% (5)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	27.3% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	

### Odessa – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	18.2% (2)	0	0	% (N)
	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	3	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	4	18.2% (2)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	63.6% (7)	0	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	27.3% (3)	0	0	
	3	0	100% (1)	0	
	4	0	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	63.6% (7)	100% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	18.2% (2)	0	0	
	3	9.1% (1)	0	0	
	4	0	0	0	

**Odessa – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	9.1% (1)	0	0	% (N)
	2	72.7% (8)	100% (1)	0	
	3	9.1% (1)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	27.3% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	2	36.4% (4)	100% (1)	0	
	3	27.3% (3)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	27.3% (3)	0	0	% (N)
	2	54.5% (6)	100% (1)	0	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	63.6% (7)	0	0	% (N)
	2	18.2% (2)	100% (1)	0	
	3	0	0	0	

## Richland – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### Richland – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	202.0	109.0	82.0	N
	Years as an educator	12.61 8.9 (0-35)	14.07 8.6 (1-39)	17.69 10.5 (2-40)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	6.88 6.4 (1-33)	6.41 6.1 (1-37)	10.51 8.8 (1-34)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	7 6.7 (1-32)	7.28 6.9 (1-37)	11.16 9.6 (1-40)	

## Richland – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	8.4% (17)	0.9% (1)	3.7% (3)	N %
	Associate's Degree	9.4% (19)	0	0	
	Bachelor's Degree	30.7% (62)	23.9% (26)	23.2% (19)	
	Master's Degree	49% (99)	72.5% (79)	70.7% (58)	
	Doctorate	0.5% (1)	0.9% (1)	0	
	Other	8.9% (18)	5.5% (6)	4.9% (4)	

Highly Qualified?	69.8% (141)	86.2% (94)	86.6% (71)	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	14.9% (30)	15.6% (17)	15.9% (13)	
Other Certification	45% (91)	50.5% (55)	46.3% (38)	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	91.6% (185)	45.9% (50)	32.9% (27)	% (N)
	Mathematics	72.3% (146)	38.5% (42)	32.9% (27)	
	Science	56.4% (114)	32.1% (35)	15.9% (13)	
	Social Studies	55.9% (113)	45% (49)	22% (18)	
	Behavior	57.4% (116)	22.9% (25)	14.6% (12)	
	Written Language	66.8% (135)	44% (48)	30.5% (25)	
	Other	18.3% (37)	25.7% (28)	22% (18)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	64.9% (131)	77.1% (84)	75.6% (62)	% (N)
	Tier II	80.2% (158)	64.2% (70)	58.5% (48)	
	Tier III	61.4% (124)	43.1% (47)	31.7% (26)	
	Accelerated	20.8% (42)	28.4% (31)	14.6% (12)	
	Other	4.5% (9)	4.6% (5)	4.9% (4)	

## Richland – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Content Area Implemented	Reading	87.6% (177)	54.1% (59)	36.6% (30)	% (N)
	Mathematics	38.1% (77)	35.8% (39)	30.5% (25)	
	Science	2% (4)	17.4% (19)	13.4% (11)	
	Social Studies	2% (4)	18.3% (20)	17.1% (14)	
	Behavior	10.4% (21)	21.1% (23)	30.5% (25)	
	Written Language	17.8% (36)	30.3% (33)	26.8% (22)	
	Other	4% (8)	7.3% (8)	9.8% (8)	

Intervention Provider	Classroom teacher	69.8% (141)	86.2% (94)	84.1% (69)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	42.1% (85)	19.3% (21)	22% (18)	
	Paraprofessional	74.8% (151)	29.4% (32)	24.4% (20)	
	Parent Volunteer	16.8% (34)	1.8% (2)	0	
	Research Staff	1% (2)	0	1.2% (1)	
	Other	5% (10)	2.8% (3)	3.7% (3)	

Level of RTI Implementation	0 – None/Don't know	9.4% (19)	11.9% (13)	18.3% (15)	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	10.9% (22)	24.8% (27)	29.3% (24)	
	2 – Installation	9.4% (19)	11.9% (13)	7.3% (6)	
	3 – Initial Implementation	19.3% (39)	22.9% (25)	7.3% (6)	
	4 – Full Implementation	19.8% (40)	11.9% (13)	12.2% (10)	
	5 – Innovation	20.3% (41)	10.1% (11)	12.2% (10)	
	6 - Sustainability	5.9% (12)	2.8% (3)	6.1% (5)	

## Richland – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	9.4% (19)	12.8% (14)	24.4% (20)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0.5% (1)	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	7.9% (16)	21.1% (23)	26.8% (22)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	18.8% (38)	23.9% (26)	14.6% (12)	
	4 – Partial Definition	26.2% (53)	17.4% (19)	13.4% (11)	
	5 – Full Definition	36.6% (74)	23.9% (26)	20.7% (17)	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	7.4% (15)	16.5% (18)	28% (23)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0.5% (1)	0.9% (1)	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	3% (6)	17.4% (19)	9.8% (8)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	28.2% (57)	30.3% (33)	39% (32)	
	4 – Partial Definition	45.5% (92)	32.1% (35)	20.7% (17)	
	5 – Full Definition	14.9% (30)	2.8% (3)	2.4% (2)	

### Richland – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	4% (8)	13.8% (15)	30.5% (25)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	5.9% (12)	4.6% (5)	4.9% (4)	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	5% (10)	21.1% (23)	24.4% (20)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	32.2% (65)	13.8% (15)	4.9% (4)	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	45.1% (91)	34.9% (38)	19.5% (16)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	5% (10)	30.3% (33)	36.6% (30)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	11.4% (23)	19.3% (21)	14.6% (12)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	33.7% (68)	10.1% (11)	8.5% (7)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	30.7% (62)	10.1% (11)	11% (9)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	3.5% (7)	11.9% (13)	12.2% (10)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	6.4% (13)	37.6% (41)	52.4% (43)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	7.4% (15)	12.8% (14)	6.1% (5)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	9.9% (20)	7.3% (8)	3.7% (3)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	42.6% (86)	11.9% (13)	9.8% (8)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	17.8% (36)	10.1% (11)	8.5% (7)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	13.4% (27)	32.1% (35)	36.6% (30)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	29.7% (60)	19.3% (21)	32.9% (27)	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	34.7% (70)	25.7% (28)	14.6% (12)	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	2% (4)	0	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	0.5% (1)	1.8% (2)	1.2% (1)	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	4.5% (9)	16.5% (18)	22% (18)	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	28.7% (58)	37.6% (41)	30.5% (25)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	21.8% (44)	14.7% (16)	4.9% (4)	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	12.9% (26)	3.7% (4)	13.4% (11)	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	12.4% (25)	8.3% (9)	13.4% (11)	

## Richland – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	26.7% (54)	36.7% (40)	37.8% (31)	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	51.5% (104)	39.4% (43)	43.9% (36)	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	15.8% (32)	14.7% (16)	7.3% (6)	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	2% (4)	1.8% (2)	1.2% (1)	

## Richland – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	18.3% (37)	20.2% (22)	9.8% (8)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	2% (4)	0	1.2% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	9.9% (20)	11.9% (13)	12.2% (10)	
	<i>3</i>	36.1% (73)	39.4% (43)	41.5% (34)	
	<i>4</i>	32.2% (65)	26.6% (29)	30.5% (25)	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	3.5% (7)	6.4% (7)	3.7% (3)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	2% (4)	2.8% (3)	6.1% (5)	
	<i>2</i>	4% (8)	11.9% (13)	9.8% (8)	
	<i>3</i>	41.6% (84)	42.2% (46)	51.2% (42)	
	<i>4</i>	48.5% (98)	34.9% (38)	25.6% (21)	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	6.9% (14)	13.8% (15)	8.5% (7)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	2% (4)	1.8% (2)	1.2% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	5% (10)	9.2% (10)	8.5% (7)	
	<i>3</i>	59.9% (121)	56% (61)	57.3% (47)	
	<i>4</i>	22.8% (46)	13.8% (15)	20.7% (17)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	14.4% (29)	11.9% (13)	17.1% (14)	% (N)
	1	4% (8)	4.6% (5)	9.8% (8)	
	2	21.8% (44)	26.6% (29)	14.6% (12)	
	3	43.1% (87)	44% (48)	39% (32)	
	4	15.8% (32)	11.9% (13)	14.6% (12)	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	17.8% (36)	19.3% (21)	17.1% (14)	% (N)
	1	4% (8)	4.6% (5)	9.8% (8)	
	2	19.3% (39)	20.2% (22)	9.8% (8)	
	3	40.1% (81)	40.4% (44)	42.7% (35)	
	4	17.8% (36)	14.7% (16)	15.9% (13)	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	4% (8)	4.6% (5)	3.7% (3)	% (N)
	1	3% (6)	8.3% (9)	2.4% (2)	
	2	14.4% (29)	12.8% (14)	12.2% (10)	
	3	54% (109)	45.9% (50)	48.8% (40)	
	4	24.3% (49)	24.8% (27)	28% (23)	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	5.9% (12)	3.7% (4)	4.9% (4)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	3.7% (4)	4.9% (4)	
	2	11.4% (23)	18.3% (20)	15.9% (13)	
	3	52% (105)	55% (60)	46.3% (38)	
	4	25.2% (51)	17.4% (19)	20.7% (17)	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	4% (8)	7.3% (8)	4.9% (4)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	5.5% (6)	1.2% (1)	
	2	9.4% (19)	5.5% (6)	2.4% (2)	
	3	42.1% (85)	47.7% (52)	45.1% (37)	
	4	40.6% (82)	31.2% (34)	42.7% (35)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	12.9% (26)	9.2% (10)	6.1% (5)	% (N)
	1	3.5% (7)	7.3% (8)	2.4% (2)	
	2	7.4% (15)	14.7% (16)	15.9% (13)	
	3	29.7% (60)	43.1% (47)	46.3% (38)	
	4	45.5% (92)	23.9% (26)	25.6% (21)	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	10.4% (21)	6.4% (7)	3.7% (3)	% (N)
	1	2% (4)	4.6% (5)	1.2% (1)	
	2	8.4% (17)	6.4% (7)	14.6% (12)	
	3	34.2% (69)	54.1% (59)	50% (41)	
	4	44.1% (89)	26.6% (29)	24.4% (20)	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	3.5% (7)	5.5% (6)	7.3% (6)	% (N)
	1	2% (4)	4.6% (5)	2.4% (2)	
	2	10.4% (21)	11% (12)	17.1% (14)	
	3	51.5% (104)	58.7% (64)	51.2% (42)	
	4	31.7% (64)	19.3% (21)	18.3% (15)	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	7.4% (15)	8.3% (9)	8.5% (7)	% (N)
	1	2% (4)	1.8% (2)	2.4% (2)	
	2	10.9% (22)	18.3% (20)	17.1% (14)	
	3	54% (109)	52.3% (57)	50% (41)	
	4	25.2% (51)	15.6% (17)	17.1% (14)	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	0.5% (1)	4.6% (5)	9.8% (8)	% (N)
	1	1.5% (3)	3.7% (4)	4.9% (4)	
	2	4% (8)	9.2% (10)	11% (9)	
	3	48% (97)	52.3% (57)	51.2% (42)	
	4	44.6% (90)	29.4% (32)	19.5% (16)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	14.4% (29)	14.7% (16)	12.2% (10)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	8.3% (9)	3.7% (3)	
	2	18.8% (38)	22% (24)	22% (18)	
	3	40.6% (82)	41.3% (45)	42.7% (35)	
	4	23.3% (47)	12.8% (14)	15.9% (13)	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	13.9% (28)	12.8% (14)	9.8% (8)	% (N)
	1	2% (4)	2.8% (3)	6.1% (5)	
	2	7.9% (16)	16.5% (18)	17.1% (14)	
	3	44.6% (90)	53.2% (58)	48.8% (40)	
	4	30.2% (61)	13.8% (15)	14.6% (12)	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	14.9% (30)	6.4% (7)	13.4% (11)	% (N)
	1	1.5% (3)	4.6% (5)	3.7% (3)	
	2	7.4% (15)	7.3% (8)	12.2% (10)	
	3	39.6% (80)	51.4% (56)	47.6% (39)	
	4	35.6% (72)	28.4% (31)	20.7% (17)	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	6.9% (14)	8.3% (9)	3.7% (3)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	0.9% (1)	0	
	2	2.5% (5)	4.6% (5)	4.9% (4)	
	3	46.5% (94)	59.6% (65)	61% (50)	
	4	40.6% (82)	24.8% (27)	24.4% (20)	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	5% (10)	1.8% (2)	4.9% (4)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	1.8% (2)	1.2% (1)	
	2	8.4% (17)	2.8% (3)	4.9% (4)	
	3	45% (91)	53.2% (58)	54.9% (45)	
	4	37.6% (76)	35.8% (39)	29.3% (24)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	5.4% (11)	1.8% (2)	9.8% (8)	% (N)
	1	3.5% (7)	3.7% (4)	1.2% (1)	
	2	6.9% (14)	4.6% (5)	2.4% (2)	
	3	47% (95)	48.6% (53)	54.9% (45)	
	4	35.6% (72)	39.4% (43)	26.8% (22)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	12.4% (25)	28.4% (31)	31.7% (26)	% (N)
	1	4% (8)	2.8% (3)	3.7% (3)	
	2	17.3% (35)	16.5% (18)	12.2% (10)	
	3	43.6% (88)	37.6% (41)	39% (32)	
	4	21.8% (44)	10.1% (11)	9.7% (8)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	9.9% (20)	24.8% (27)	30.5% (25)	% (N)
	1	4.5% (9)	1.8% (2)	2.4% (2)	
	2	20.8% (42)	22.9% (25)	19.5% (16)	
	3	38.1% (77)	38.5% (42)	39% (32)	
	4	24.3% (49)	9.2% (10)	3.7% (3)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	10.9% (22)	24.8% (27)	30.5% (25)	% (N)
	1	1% (2)	0.9% (1)	1.2% (1)	
	2	9.4% (19)	19.3% (21)	11% (9)	
	3	55% (111)	37.6% (41)	41.5% (34)	
	4	21.8% (44)	12.8% (14)	9.8% (8)	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	5.4% (11)	19.3% (21)	31.7% (26)	% (N)
	1	3.5% (7)	0	1.2% (1)	
	2	7.9% (16)	11.9% (13)	15.9% (13)	
	3	47.5% (96)	52.3% (57)	39% (32)	
	4	35.1% (71)	11.9% (13)	6.1% (5)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	13.4% (27)	23.9% (26)	31.7% (26)	% (N)
	1	2% (4)	0.9% (1)	3.7% (3)	
	2	16.3% (33)	24.8% (27)	18.3% (15)	
	3	39.1% (79)	36.7% (40)	32.9% (27)	
	4	27.2% (55)	6.4% (7)	6.1% (5)	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	32.7% (66)	40.4% (44)	34.1% (28)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	0.9% (1)	2.4% (2)	
	2	10.9% (22)	7.3% (8)	11% (9)	
	3	39.1% (79)	40.4% (44)	32.9% (27)	
	4	13.9% (28)	5.5% (6)	12.2% (10)	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	7.4% (15)	11.9% (13)	11% (9)	% (N)
	1	3.5% (7)	1.8% (2)	1.2% (1)	
	2	14.4% (29)	16.5% (18)	11% (9)	
	3	52.5% (106)	46.8% (51)	52.4% (43)	
	4	20.8% (42)	16.5% (18)	18.3% (15)	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	4% (8)	7.3% (8)	4.9% (4)	% (N)
	1	1.5% (3)	6.4% (7)	1.2% (1)	
	2	14.9% (30)	18.3% (20)	13.4% (11)	
	3	48.5% (98)	45% (49)	57.3% (47)	
	4	28.2% (57)	18.3% (20)	14.6% (12)	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	16.8% (34)	19.3% (21)	19.5% (16)	% (N)
	1	4% (8)	11% (12)	4.9% (4)	
	2	24.3% (49)	25.7% (28)	19.5% (16)	
	3	39.1% (79)	32.1% (35)	36.6% (30)	
	4	13.4% (27)	7.3% (8)	12.2% (10)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	9.9% (20)	16.5% (18)	23.2% (19)	% (N)
	1	5.4% (11)	7.3% (8)	4.9% (4)	
	2	18.3% (37)	27.5% (30)	15.9% (13)	
	3	45% (91)	37.6% (41)	30.5% (25)	
	4	18.8% (38)	6.4% (7)	19.5% (16)	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	23.8% (48)	34.9% (38)	22% (18)	% (N)
	1	5% (10)	1.8% (2)	3.7% (3)	
	2	17.3% (35)	17.4% (19)	8.5% (7)	
	3	35.6% (72)	34.9% (38)	41.5% (34)	
	4	15.8% (32)	6.4% (7)	17.1% (14)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	5.4% (11)	3.7% (4)	7.3% (6)	% (N)
	1	1.5% (3)	1.8% (2)	0	
	2	3% (6)	2.8% (3)	3.7% (3)	
	3	45% (91)	51.4% (56)	47.6% (39)	
	4	43.6% (88)	35.8% (39)	35.3% (29)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	8.9% (18)	18.3% (20)	9.8% (8)	% (N)
	1	3% (6)	3.7% (4)	1.2% (1)	
	2	17.8% (36)	17.4% (19)	13.4% (11)	
	3	44.6% (90)	41.3% (45)	50% (41)	
	4	24.3% (49)	14.7% (16)	19.5% (16)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	1.5% (3)	2.8% (3)	4.9% (4)	% (N)
	1	1.5% (3)	2.8% (3)	0	
	2	1% (2)	1.8% (2)	2.4% (2)	
	3	41.6% (84)	42.2% (46)	45.1% (37)	
	4	52% (105)	47.7% (52)	41.5% (34)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	8.4% (17)	10.1% (11)	14.6% (12)	% (N)
	1	3% (6)	2.8% (3)	1.2% (1)	
	2	16.3% (33)	9.2% (10)	8.5% (7)	
	3	43.1% (87)	44% (48)	51.2% (42)	
	4	28.2% (57)	28.4% (31)	18.3% (15)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	16.3% (33)	20.2% (22)	25.6% (21)	% (N)
	1	5.4% (11)	5.5% (6)	2.4% (2)	
	2	11.9% (24)	17.4% (19)	13.4% (11)	
	3	43.6% (88)	36.7% (40)	39% (32)	
	4	19.8% (40)	14.7% (16)	13.4% (11)	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	10.4% (21)	22.9% (25)	18.3% (15)	% (N)
	1	3% (6)	2.8% (3)	2.4% (2)	
	2	9.9% (20)	11% (12)	11% (9)	
	3	48.5% (98)	42.2% (46)	45.1% (37)	
	4	27.7% (56)	13.8% (15)	15.9% (13)	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	16.8% (34)	24.8% (27)	28% (23)	% (N)
	1	2.5% (5)	5.5% (6)	2.4% (2)	
	2	12.9% (26)	18.3% (20)	7.3% (6)	
	3	47.5% (96)	34.9% (38)	41.5% (34)	
	4	19.8% (40)	10.1% (11)	12.2% (10)	

**Richland – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	29.2% (59)	44% (48)	39% (32)	% (N)
	1	3% (6)	2.8% (3)	1.2% (1)	
	2	11.9% (24)	9.2% (10)	6.1% (5)	
	3	37.1% (75)	31.2% (34)	35.4% (29)	
	4	17.8% (36)	9.2% (10)	11% (9)	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	57.9% (117)	62.4% (68)	53.7% (44)	% (N)
	1	1% (2)	1.8% (2)	0	
	2	4.5% (9)	2.8% (3)	4.9% (4)	
	3	21.3% (43)	23.9% (26)	26.8% (22)	
	4	13.9% (28)	5.5% (6)	8.5% (7)	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	69.3% (140)	73.4% (80)	58.5% (48)	% (N)
	1	1% (2)	1.8% (2)	1.2% (1)	
	2	4% (8)	0.9% (1)	1.2% (1)	
	3	14.4% (29)	18.3% (20)	25.6% (21)	
	4	9.4% (19)	2.8% (3)	7.3% (6)	

**Richland – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	37.6% (76)	26.6% (29)	37.8% (31)	% (N)
	2	50% (101)	58.7% (64)	43.9% (36)	
	3	5.9% (12)	5.5% (6)	1.2% (1)	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	53.5% (108)	35.8% (39)	42.7% (35)	% (N)
	2	32.2% (65)	50.5% (55)	37.8% (31)	
	3	8.4% (17)	4.6% (5)	2.4% (2)	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	39.6% (80)	26.6% (29)	37.8% (31)	% (N)
	2	55.4% (112)	61.5% (67)	42.7% (35)	
	3	0.5% (1)	0.9% (1)	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	52.5% (106)	33.9% (37)	41.5% (34)	% (N)
	2	37.1% (75)	52.3% (57)	34.1% (28)	
	3	2% (4)	0	2.4% (2)	

## Stevenson Carson – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### Stevenson Carson – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	29.0	6.0	13.0	N
	Years as an educator	11.26 9.8 (1-37)	15.67 10.5 (1-28)	17.08 8.2 (2-29)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	6.62 6.4 (1-21)	7.33 8.3 (1-22)	13.69 8.3 (2-29)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	5.04 4.4 (1-15)	9.83 8.1 (1-24)	14.46 9.1 (2-29)	

## Stevenson Carson – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	13.8% (4)	0	15.4% (2)	N %
	Associate's Degree	10.3% (3)	0	7.7% (1)	
	Bachelor's Degree	20.7% (6)	50% (3)	0	
	Master's Degree	48.3% (14)	50% (3)	69.2% (9)	
	Doctorate	0	0	0	
	Other	13.8% (4)	0	7.7% (1)	

Highly Qualified?	58.6% (17)	66.7% (4)	53.8% (7)	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	10.3% (3)	16.7% (1)	0	
Other Certification	41.4% (12)	0	53.8% (7)	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	100% (29)	66.7% (4)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	Mathematics	34.5% (10)	50% (3)	38.5% (5)	
	Science	20.7% (6)	16.7% (1)	38.5% (5)	
	Social Studies	20.7% (6)	16.7% (1)	38.5% (5)	
	Behavior	31% (9)	66.7% (4)	30.8% (4)	
	Written Language	24.1% (7)	50% (3)	53.8% (7)	
	Other	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	53.8% (7)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	55.2% (16)	66.7% (4)	76.9% (10)	% (N)
	Tier II	55.2% (16)	16.7% (1)	61.5% (8)	
	Tier III	48.3% (14)	0	53.8% (7)	
	Accelerated	10.3% (3)	0	30.8% (4)	
	Other	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	

## Stevenson Carson – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Implemented</b>	Reading	96.6% (28)	50% (3)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	Mathematics	6.9% (2)	0	7.7% (1)	
	Science	3.4% (1)	0	15.4% (2)	
	Social Studies	0	0	7.7% (1)	
	Behavior	0	0	7.7% (1)	
	Written Language	6.9% (2)	0	15.4% (2)	
	Other	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	

<b>Intervention Provider</b>	Classroom teacher	44.8% (13)	50% (3)	38.5% (5)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	0	
	Paraprofessional	75.9% (22)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
	Parent Volunteer	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	Research Staff	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	Other	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	

<b>Level of RTI Implementation</b>	0 – None/Don't know	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
	2 – Installation	0	0	0	
	3 – Initial Implementation	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	4 – Full Implementation	13.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	
	5 – Innovation	41.4% (12)	16.7% (1)	0	
	6 - Sustainability	34.5% (10)	0	7.7% (1)	

## Stevenson Carson – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	3.4% (1)	33.3% (2)	69.2% (9)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	20.7% (6)	0	7.7% (1)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	20.7% (6)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
	4 – Partial Definition	20.7% (6)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
	5 – Full Definition	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	0	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	0	50% (3)	61.5% (8)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	3.4% (1)	0	7.7% (1)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	62.1% (18)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
	4 – Partial Definition	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
	5 – Full Definition	10.3% (3)	16.7% (1)	0	

### Stevenson Carson – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	6.9% (2)	0	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	17.2% (5)	0	0	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	0	0	7.7% (1)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	41.4% (12)	50% (3)	0	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	31% (9)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	0	0	23.1% (3)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	10.3% (3)	0	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	24.1% (7)	0	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	48.3% (14)	66.7% (4)	7.7% (1)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	0	0	7.7% (1)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	3.4% (1)	0	23.1% (3)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	10.3% (3)	0	7.7% (1)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	62.1% (18)	50% (3)	0	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	3.4% (1)	0	7.7% (1)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	38.5% (5)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	17.2% (5)	33.3% (2)	0	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	65.5% (19)	16.7% (1)	0	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	0	0	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	0	0	0	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	0	0	7.7% (1)	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	0	16.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	69% (20)	50% (3)	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	20.7% (6)	0	7.7% (1)	

### Stevenson Carson – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	1 = none	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	2 = 1 or 2	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	3 = 3 or 4	31% (9)	0	0	
	4 = 5 or more	37.9% (11)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	

### Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	0	27.6% (8)	66.7% (4)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	44.8% (13)	0	30.8% (4)	
	4	20.7% (6)	33.3% (2)	0	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	0	0	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	
	4	51.7% (15)	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	0	6.9% (2)	33.3% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	15.4% (2)	
	3	65.5% (19)	50% (3)	15.4% (2)	
	4	17.2% (5)	0	7.7% (1)	

### Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	2	24.1% (7)	0	7.7% (1)	
	3	48.3% (14)	66.7% (4)	7.7% (1)	
	4	24.1% (7)	0	7.7% (1)	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	10.3% (3)	0	15.4% (2)	
	3	62.1% (18)	50% (3)	0	
	4	20.7% (6)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	20.7% (6)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	3	48.3% (14)	33.3% (2)	23.1% (3)	
	4	27.6% (8)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	2	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	3	51.7% (15)	0	7.7% (1)	
	4	34.5% (10)	50% (3)	15.4% (2)	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	6.9% (2)	33.3% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	0	0	
	3	51.7% (15)	16.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	
	4	31% (9)	50% (3)	15.4% (2)	

### Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	13.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	13.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	51.7% (15)	33.3% (2)	0	
	3	13.8% (4)	0	23.1% (3)	
	4	6.9% (2)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	10.3% (3)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	6.9% (2)	50% (3)	0	
	2	31% (9)	0	0	
	3	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	
	4	17.2% (5)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	0	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	0	0	15.4% (2)	
	3	44.8% (13)	33.3% (2)	23.1% (3)	
	4	55.2% (16)	33.3% (2)	0	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	15.4% (2)	
	3	58.6% (17)	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	
	4	31% (9)	33.3% (2)	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	0	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	3	31% (9)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
	4	65.5% (19)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	

**Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	0	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	
	3	55.2% (16)	0	0	
	4	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	13.8% (4)	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	0	0	15.4% (2)	
	3	37.9% (11)	33.3% (2)	0	
	4	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	13.8% (4)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	7.7% (1)	
	3	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	48.3% (14)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	13.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	0	0	7.7% (1)	
	3	27.6% (8)	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	
	4	55.2% (16)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	0	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	41.4% (12)	33.3% (2)	30.8% (4)	
	4	55.2% (16)	50% (3)	7.7% (1)	

### Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	0	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	0	0	
	3	37.9% (11)	33.3% (2)	30.8% (4)	
	4	51.7% (15)	50% (3)	7.7% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	3.4% (1)	50% (3)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	17.2% (5)	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	55.2% (16)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	6.9% (2)	50% (3)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	10.3% (3)	50% (3)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	51.7% (15)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	0	50% (3)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	55.2% (16)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	0	

**Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	0	50% (3)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	10.3% (3)	0	0	
	3	51.7% (15)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	27.6% (8)	16.7% (1)	0	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	27.6% (8)	66.7% (4)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	0	0	
	3	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	13.8% (4)	0	0	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	3.4% (1)	33.3% (2)	23.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	3	37.9% (11)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
	4	48.3% (14)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	3.4% (1)	33.3% (2)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	0	7.7% (1)	
	3	44.8% (13)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
	4	41.4% (12)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	3.4% (1)	66.7% (4)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	62.1% (18)	0	7.7% (1)	
	4	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	0	

### Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	0	50% (3)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	3	62.1% (18)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	
	4	31% (9)	0	0	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	31% (9)	66.7% (4)	23.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	3	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	20.7% (6)	0	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	0	33.3% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	0	0	0	
	3	34.5% (10)	66.7% (4)	15.4% (2)	
	4	55.2% (16)	0	23.1% (3)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	3.4% (1)	33.3% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	3	48.3% (14)	33.3% (2)	23.1% (3)	
	4	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	0	33.3% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	6.9% (2)	0	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	3	31% (9)	50% (3)	15.4% (2)	
	4	55.2% (16)	16.7% (1)	23.1% (3)	

**Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	6.9% (2)	50% (3)	15.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	17.2% (5)	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	41.4% (12)	16.7% (1)	15.4% (2)	
	4	31% (9)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	6.9% (2)	66.7% (4)	23.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	0	0	
	3	37.9% (11)	0	7.7% (1)	
	4	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	0	50% (3)	23.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	3	37.9% (11)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
	4	55.2% (16)	16.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	10.3% (3)	83.3% (5)	23.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	41.4% (12)	0	7.7% (1)	
	4	37.9% (11)	0	7.7% (1)	

**Stevenson Carson – Implementation Coherence, Continued**  
**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	13.8% (4)	83.3% (5)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	10.3% (3)	16.7% (1)	0	
	3	48.3% (14)	0	0	
	4	24.1% (7)	0	7.7% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	58.6% (17)	100% (6)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	6.9% (2)	0	0	
	3	20.7% (6)	0	7.7% (1)	
	4	3.4% (1)	0	0	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	72.4% (21)	100% (6)	30.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	3.4% (1)	0	0	
	3	17.2% (5)	0	7.7% (1)	
	4	3.4% (1)	0	0	

**Stevenson Carson – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	55.2% (16)	16.7% (1)	0	% (N)
	2	34.5% (10)	16.7% (1)	38.5% (5)	
	3	6.9% (2)	16.7% (1)	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	75.9% (22)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	2	13.8% (4)	16.7% (1)	30.8% (4)	
	3	3.4% (1)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	48.3% (14)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	2	44.8% (13)	16.7% (1)	30.8% (4)	
	3	3.4% (1)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	69% (20)	33.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	% (N)
	2	24.1% (7)	16.7% (1)	30.8% (4)	
	3	0	0	0	

## Walla Walla – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### Walla Walla – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	104.0	42.0	20.0	N
	Years as an educator	15.37 10.2 (1-40)	14.81 8.9 (2-40)	10.85 7.7 (3-30)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	8.69 7.4 (1-38)	10.39 6.8 (2-30)	6.1 4.6 (1-19)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	7.82 8.2 (1-35)	8.5 7.7 (1-40)	5.42 5.7 (1-19)	

## Walla Walla – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	10.6% (11)	2.4% (1)	0	N %
	Associate's Degree	4.8% (5)	9.5% (4)	5% (1)	
	Bachelor's Degree	30.8% (32)	23.8% (10)	35% (7)	
	Master's Degree	49% (51)	64.3% (27)	60% (12)	
	Doctorate	1% (1)	0	0	
	Other	16.3% (17)	9.5% (4)	10% (2)	

Highly Qualified?	72.1% (75)	78.6% (33)	55% (11)	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	8.7% (9)	11.9% (5)	30% (6)	
Other Certification	64.4% (67)	54.8% (23)	60% (12)	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	95.2% (99)	59.5% (25)	50% (10)	% (N)
	Mathematics	76.9% (80)	52.4% (22)	35% (7)	
	Science	50% (52)	31% (13)	5% (1)	
	Social Studies	51% (53)	38.1% (16)	25% (5)	
	Behavior	51% (53)	16.7% (7)	15% (3)	
	Written Language	75% (78)	54.8% (23)	50% (10)	
	Other	23.1% (24)	26.2% (11)	30% (6)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	66.3% (69)	73.8% (31)	65% (13)	% (N)
	Tier II	73.1% (76)	54.8% (23)	65% (13)	
	Tier III	23.1% (24)	16.7% (7)	30% (6)	
	Accelerated	13.5% (14)	11.9% (5)	10% (2)	
	Other	5.8% (6)	14.3% (6)	10% (2)	

## Walla Walla – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Implemented</b>	Reading	88.5% (92)	45.2% (19)	35% (7)	% (N)
	Mathematics	44.2% (46)	31% (13)	15% (3)	
	Science	10.6% (11)	11.9% (5)	5% (1)	
	Social Studies	11.5% (12)	19% (8)	20% (4)	
	Behavior	26% (27)	14.3% (6)	15% (3)	
	Written Language	28.8% (30)	33.3% (14)	35% (7)	
	Other	6.7% (7)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	

<b>Intervention Provider</b>	Classroom teacher	70.2% (73)	88.1% (37)	95% (19)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	69.2% (72)	23.8% (10)	10% (2)	
	Paraprofessional	67.3% (70)	38.1% (16)	35% (7)	
	Parent Volunteer	13.5% (14)	2.4% (1)	0	
	Research Staff	4.8% (5)	4.8% (2)	0	
	Other	15.4% (16)	9.5% (4)	5% (1)	

<b>Level of RTI Implementation</b>	0 – None/Don't know	10.6% (11)	14.3% (6)	30% (6)	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	14.4% (15)	45.2% (19)	15% (3)	
	2 – Installation	1.9% (2)	7.1% (3)	5% (1)	
	3 – Initial Implementation	23.1% (24)	9.5% (4)	15% (3)	
	4 – Full Implementation	26% (27)	9.5% (4)	15% (3)	
	5 – Innovation	6.7% (7)	2.4% (1)	10% (2)	
	6 - Sustainability	14.5% (15)	0	5% (1)	

## Walla Walla – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	11.5% (12)	9.5% (4)	5% (1)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	18.3% (19)	19% (8)	40% (8)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	21.2% (22)	19% (8)	25% (5)	
	4 – Partial Definition	18.3% (19)	14.3% (6)	15% (3)	
	5 – Full Definition	30.8% (32)	38.1% (16)	15% (3)	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	9.6% (10)	9.5% (4)	5% (1)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	2.4% (1)	5% (1)	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	6.7% (7)	14.3% (6)	25% (5)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	24% (25)	42.9% (18)	35% (7)	
	4 – Partial Definition	45.2% (47)	23.8% (10)	20% (4)	
	5 – Full Definition	14.4% (15)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	

## Walla Walla – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	10.6% (11)	26.2% (11)	20% (4)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	1% (1)	2.4% (1)	15% (3)	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	1.9% (2)	11.9% (5)	5% (1)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	28.8% (30)	7.1% (3)	20% (4)	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	50% (52)	38.1% (16)	35% (7)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	15.4% (16)	21.4% (9)	5% (1)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	10.6% (11)	23.8% (10)	35% (7)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	9.6% (10)	11.9% (5)	5% (1)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	27.9% (29)	11.9% (5)	15% (3)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	24.1% (25)	2.4% (1)	20% (4)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	43.3% (45)	42.9% (18)	40% (8)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	4.8% (5)	9.5% (4)	20% (4)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	0	7.1% (3)	0	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	11.5% (12)	7.1% (3)	5% (1)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	19.2% (20)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	16.3% (17)	16.7% (7)	30% (6)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	17.3% (18)	33.3% (14)	25% (5)	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	32.7% (34)	26.2% (11)	20% (4)	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	9.6% (10)	0	10% (2)	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	1.9% (2)	0	5% (1)	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	10.6% (11)	11.9% (5)	15% (3)	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	23.1% (24)	35.7% (15)	35% (7)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	31.7% (33)	28.6% (12)	20% (4)	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	8.7% (9)	0	5% (1)	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	15.4% (16)	0	5% (1)	

## Walla Walla – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	36.5% (38)	35.7% (15)	30% (6)	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	43.3% (45)	42.9% (18)	50% (10)	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	12.5% (13)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	3.9% (4)	0	5% (1)	

## Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence

**(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	26.9% (28)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	2.4% (1)	0	
	<i>2</i>	4.8% (5)	16.7% (7)	10% (2)	
	<i>3</i>	36.5% (38)	54.8% (23)	70% (14)	
	<i>4</i>	29.8% (31)	16.7% (7)	10% (2)	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	2.9% (3)	2.4% (1)	15% (3)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	1% (1)	2.4% (1)	10% (2)	
	<i>2</i>	1.9% (2)	7.1% (3)	15% (3)	
	<i>3</i>	35.6% (37)	50% (21)	35% (7)	
	<i>4</i>	57.7% (60)	35.7% (15)	25% (5)	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	6.7% (7)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	0	5% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	9.6% (10)	16.7% (7)	0	
	<i>3</i>	60.6% (63)	61.9% (26)	75% (15)	
	<i>4</i>	22.1% (23)	14.3% (6)	5% (1)	

### Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	14.4% (15)	11.9% (5)	30% (6)	% (N)
	1	2.9% (3)	2.4% (1)	10% (2)	
	2	13.5% (14)	28.6% (12)	25% (5)	
	3	40.4% (42)	40.5% (17)	25% (5)	
	4	27.9% (29)	14.3% (6)	5% (1)	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	19.2% (20)	19% (8)	30% (6)	% (N)
	1	0	0	5% (1)	
	2	10.6% (11)	21.4% (9)	20% (4)	
	3	48.1% (50)	42.9% (18)	30% (6)	
	4	20.2% (21)	14.3% (6)	15% (3)	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	6.7% (7)	4.8% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	3.8% (4)	2.4% (1)	5% (1)	
	2	12.5% (13)	11.9% (5)	25% (5)	
	3	52.9% (55)	52.4% (22)	50% (10)	
	4	23.1% (24)	26.2% (11)	20% (4)	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	6.7% (7)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	% (N)
	1	0	0	5% (1)	
	2	8.7% (9)	14.3% (6)	20% (4)	
	3	44.2% (46)	54.8% (23)	55% (11)	
	4	39.4% (41)	23.8% (10)	10% (2)	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	7.7% (8)	0	5% (1)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	4.8% (5)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	
	3	43.3% (45)	52.4% (22)	60% (12)	
	4	41.3% (43)	38.1% (16)	25% (5)	

## Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	10.6% (11)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	% (N)
	1	5.8% (6)	4.8% (2)	0	
	2	18.3% (19)	14.3% (6)	10% (2)	
	3	23.1% (24)	52.4% (22)	60% (12)	
	4	40.4% (42)	23.8% (10)	20% (4)	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	4.8% (5)	4.8% (2)	0	% (N)
	1	4.8% (5)	0	0	
	2	11.5% (12)	9.5% (4)	10% (2)	
	3	37.5% (39)	54.8% (23)	70% (14)	
	4	38.5% (40)	28.6% (12)	20% (4)	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	4.8% (5)	2.4% (1)	0	% (N)
	1	0	0	10% (2)	
	2	6.7% (7)	19% (8)	25% (5)	
	3	44.2% (46)	64.3% (27)	50% (10)	
	4	43.3% (45)	14.3% (6)	10% (2)	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	7.7% (8)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	5% (1)	
	2	6.7% (7)	14.3% (6)	25% (5)	
	3	53.8% (56)	59.5% (25)	45% (9)	
	4	30.8% (32)	16.7% (7)	10% (2)	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	2.9% (3)	4.8% (2)	25% (5)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	4.8% (5)	7.1% (3)	20% (4)	
	3	33.7% (35)	59.5% (25)	40% (8)	
	4	57.7% (60)	26.2% (11)	15% (3)	

## Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	14.4% (15)	19% (8)	25% (5)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	11.5% (12)	28.6% (12)	35% (7)	
	3	47.1% (49)	40.5% (17)	30% (6)	
	4	24% (25)	11.9% (5)	10% (2)	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	6.7% (7)	9.5% (4)	30% (6)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	1.9% (2)	21.4% (9)	15% (3)	
	3	53.8% (56)	42.9% (18)	45% (9)	
	4	36.5% (38)	21.4% (9)	10% (2)	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	14.4% (15)	14.3% (6)	50% (10)	% (N)
	1	3.8% (4)	0	5% (1)	
	2	4.8% (5)	11.9% (5)	5% (1)	
	3	44.2% (46)	45.2% (19)	20% (4)	
	4	31.7% (33)	28.6% (12)	20% (4)	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	5.8% (6)	0	10% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	0	7.1% (3)	20% (4)	
	3	46.2% (48)	54.8% (23)	45% (9)	
	4	46.2% (48)	33.3% (14)	20% (4)	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	5.8% (6)	0	15% (3)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	1.9% (2)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
	3	40.4% (42)	59.5% (25)	50% (10)	
	4	49% (51)	33.3% (14)	30% (6)	

### Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	8.7% (9)	0	10% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	2.9% (3)	7.1% (3)	5% (1)	
	3	34.6% (36)	52.4% (22)	55% (11)	
	4	51% (53)	40.5% (17)	30% (6)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	20.2% (21)	31% (13)	40% (8)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	0	0	
	2	6.7% (7)	16.7% (7)	5% (1)	
	3	51% (53)	40.5% (17)	45% (9)	
	4	18.3% (19)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	17.3% (18)	33.3% (14)	50% (10)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	0	5% (1)	
	2	11.5% (12)	11.9% (5)	0	
	3	50% (52)	42.9% (18)	40% (8)	
	4	17.3% (18)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	14.4% (15)	26.2% (11)	40% (8)	% (N)
	1	0	0	5% (1)	
	2	4.8% (5)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
	3	52.9% (55)	52.4% (22)	35% (7)	
	4	24% (25)	14.3% (6)	10% (2)	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	8.7% (9)	28.6% (12)	45% (9)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	0	5% (1)	
	2	3.8% (4)	7.1% (3)	5% (1)	
	3	51.9% (54)	52.4% (22)	30% (6)	
	4	31.7% (33)	9.5% (4)	10% (2)	

### Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	16.3% (17)	33.3% (14)	40% (8)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	11.5% (12)	21.4% (9)	25% (5)	
	3	46.2% (48)	31% (13)	20% (4)	
	4	23.1% (24)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	29.8% (31)	47.6% (20)	50% (10)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	5.8% (6)	2.4% (1)	20% (4)	
	3	47.1% (49)	40.5% (17)	15% (3)	
	4	14.4% (15)	2.4% (1)	10% (2)	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	9.6% (10)	11.9% (5)	25% (5)	% (N)
	1	0	0	5% (1)	
	2	4.8% (5)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	
	3	54.8% (57)	42.9% (18)	40% (8)	
	4	27.9% (29)	31% (13)	15% (3)	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	8.7% (9)	0	15% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	6.7% (7)	9.5% (4)	25% (5)	
	3	51% (53)	57.1% (24)	40% (8)	
	4	30.8% (32)	23.8% (10)	15% (3)	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	26.9% (28)	26.2% (11)	45% (9)	% (N)
	1	4.8% (5)	2.4% (1)	0	
	2	23.1% (24)	14.3% (6)	5% (1)	
	3	29.8% (31)	45.2% (19)	35% (7)	
	4	12.5% (13)	4.8% (2)	10% (2)	

## Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	19.2% (20)	38.1% (16)	40% (8)	% (N)
	1	4.8% (5)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
	2	7.7% (8)	19% (8)	20% (4)	
	3	47.1% (49)	31% (13)	25% (5)	
	4	18.3% (19)	7.1% (3)	5% (1)	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	33.7% (35)	33.3% (14)	40% (8)	% (N)
	1	2.9% (3)	0	0	
	2	9.6% (10)	19% (8)	15% (3)	
	3	37.5% (39)	35.7% (15)	25% (5)	
	4	13.5% (14)	7.1% (3)	15% (3)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	1% (1)	0	5% (1)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	0	0	
	2	1.9% (2)	7.1% (3)	5% (1)	
	3	50% (52)	52.4% (22)	45% (9)	
	4	43.3% (45)	38.1% (16)	40% (8)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	4.8% (5)	0	20% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	0	15% (3)	
	2	8.7% (9)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	
	3	43.3% (45)	54.8% (23)	30% (6)	
	4	40.4% (42)	35.7% (15)	20% (4)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	2.9% (3)	0	10% (2)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	2.4% (1)	5% (1)	
	2	2.9% (3)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
	3	38.5% (40)	40.5% (17)	35% (7)	
	4	51.9% (54)	52.4% (22)	35% (7)	

### Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	6.7% (7)	9.5% (4)	15% (3)	% (N)
	1	1.9% (2)	0	15% (3)	
	2	10.6% (11)	7.1% (3)	10% (2)	
	3	42.3% (44)	45.2% (19)	30% (6)	
	4	35.6% (37)	35.7% (15)	25% (5)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	30.8% (32)	31% (13)	25% (5)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	2.4% (1)	5% (1)	
	2	10.6% (11)	14.3% (6)	15% (3)	
	3	40.4% (42)	35.7% (15)	30% (6)	
	4	13.5% (14)	11.9% (5)	20% (4)	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	16.3% (17)	33.3% (14)	25% (5)	% (N)
	1	0	0	5% (1)	
	2	6.7% (7)	2.4% (1)	20% (4)	
	3	50% (52)	40.5% (17)	40% (8)	
	4	23.1% (24)	19% (8)	5% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	26% (27)	38.1% (16)	45% (9)	% (N)
	1	0	0	0	
	2	12.5% (13)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
	3	42.3% (44)	33.3% (14)	20% (4)	
	4	16.3% (17)	14.3% (6)	20% (4)	

### Walla Walla – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	39.4% (41)	54.8% (23)	60% (12)	% (N)
	1	1.9% (2)	0	0	
	2	5.8% (6)	4.8% (2)	0	
	3	33.7% (35)	23.8% (10)	20% (4)	
	4	16.3% (17)	9.5% (4)	15% (3)	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	58.7% (61)	69% (29)	80% (16)	% (N)
	1	3.8% (4)	0	0	
	2	7.7% (8)	7.1% (3)	0	
	3	18.3% (19)	9.5% (4)	10% (2)	
	4	8.7% (9)	4.8% (2)	5% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	61.5% (64)	76.2% (32)	75% (15)	% (N)
	1	1% (1)	0	0	
	2	2.9% (3)	2.4% (1)	0	
	3	18.3% (19)	9.5% (4)	15% (3)	
	4	13.5% (14)	2.4% (1)	5% (1)	

**Walla Walla – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	56.7% (59)	28.6% (12)	30% (6)	% (N)
	2	30.8% (32)	54.8% (23)	50% (10)	
	3	0	2.4% (1)	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	62.5% (65)	23.8% (10)	60% (12)	% (N)
	2	24% (25)	59.5% (25)	15% (3)	
	3	0	4.8% (2)	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	54.8% (57)	31% (13)	50% (10)	% (N)
	2	31.7% (33)	54.8% (23)	25% (5)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	55.8% (58)	42.9% (18)	60% (12)	% (N)
	2	29.8% (31)	35.7% (15)	15% (3)	
	3	0	2.4% (1)	0	

## White River – Survey Results by School Level

Classification of responses into “Elementary”, “Middle” and “High” school levels were based on respondents’ indications of which grade(s) they teach. Several respondents self-identified as instructors of both elementary and middle grades, both middle and high grades, or even all grades (K-12). To avoid double-counting these responses, respondents were classified as “Elementary” if they indicated that they teach grades K, 1, 2, 3, or 4. They were classified as “Middle” only if they indicated that they teach grades 5, 6, 7, or 8 (and not any of grades K-4). They were classified as “High” only if they indicated that they teach grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (and none of grades K-8). In other words, as long as a respondent self-identified as a teacher of grades K-4, they were considered “Elementary” instructors, then if they self-identified as a teacher of grades 5-8, they were considered “Middle” instructors, and the remaining respondents who self-identified as teachers only of grades 9-12 were considered “High” instructors. This summary excludes respondents who indicated that RTI was not being implemented in the classroom(s) in which they teach (i.e., those who selected “None” in response to question “In what area(s) is RTI being used (select all that apply) in the classroom in which you teach/work?”). This summary includes all respondent types (i.e., teachers, paraeducators, and other respondents).

### White River – Description of Survey Respondents

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Totals</b>	Total Number of Respondents	69.0	40.0	37.0	N
	Years as an educator	16.1 8.7 (1-34)	14.15 7.3 (1-31)	13.06 9.7 (1-38)	mean s.d. (range)
	Years at current school	10.33 6.3 (1-26)	6.51 4.1 (1-21)	6.38 5.7 (1-23)	
	Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	8.66 7.4 (1-27)	7.58 6.5 (1-31)	8.21 8.1 (1-38)	

## White River – Description of Survey Respondents, Continued

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Highest Degree</b>	High School	13% (9)	2.5% (1)	8.1% (3)	N %
	Associate's Degree	8.7% (6)	0	5.4% (2)	
	Bachelor's Degree	27.5% (19)	27.5% (11)	21.6% (8)	
	Master's Degree	47.8% (33)	67.5% (27)	62.2% (23)	
	Doctorate	0	2.5% (1)	0	
	Other	11.6% (8)	5% (2)	8.1% (3)	

Highly Qualified?	62.3% (43)	75% (30)	67.6% (25)	% Yes
SPED Endorsement	15.9% (11)	10% (4)	10.8% (4)	
Other Certification	42% (29)	60% (24)	37.8% (14)	

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Content Area Taught</b>	Reading	95.7% (66)	47.5% (19)	32.4% (12)	% (N)
	Mathematics	87% (60)	55% (22)	40.5% (15)	
	Science	55.1% (38)	30% (12)	21.6% (8)	
	Social Studies	44.9% (31)	30% (12)	13.5% (5)	
	Behavior	42% (29)	20% (8)	18.9% (7)	
	Written Language	62.3% (43)	35% (14)	29.7% (11)	
	Other	11.6% (8)	22.5% (9)	32.4% (12)	

<b>Level Of Instruction Taught</b>	Tier I	63.8% (44)	80% (32)	70.3% (26)	% (N)
	Tier II	71% (49)	50% (20)	54.1% (20)	
	Tier III	55.1% (38)	17.5% (7)	40.5% (15)	
	Accelerated	21.7% (15)	12.5% (5)	2.7% (1)	
	Other	4.3% (3)	5% (2)	10.8% (4)	

## White River – RTI Questions

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Content Area Implemented	Reading	91.3% (63)	40% (16)	37.8% (14)	% (N)
	Mathematics	39.1% (27)	50% (20)	35.1% (13)	
	Science	4.3% (3)	5% (2)	10.8% (4)	
	Social Studies	4.3% (3)	15% (6)	2.7% (1)	
	Behavior	17.4% (12)	20% (8)	24.3% (9)	
	Written Language	13% (9)	27.5% (11)	35.1% (13)	
	Other	1.4% (1)	7.5% (3)	18.9% (7)	

Intervention Provider	Classroom teacher	58% (40)	95% (38)	89.2% (33)	% (N)
	Specialized teacher	58% (40)	27.5% (11)	18.9% (7)	
	Paraprofessional	69.6% (48)	30% (12)	24.3% (9)	
	Parent Volunteer	21.7% (15)	10% (4)	2.7% (1)	
	Research Staff	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	0	
	Other	4.3% (3)	5% (2)	2.7% (1)	

Level of RTI Implementation	0 – None/Don't know	2.9% (2)	7.5% (3)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	1 – Exploration	18.8% (13)	22.5% (9)	18.9% (7)	
	2 – Installation	7.2% (5)	20% (8)	16.2% (6)	
	3 – Initial Implementation	17.4% (12)	22.5% (9)	21.6% (8)	
	4 – Full Implementation	15.9% (11)	10% (4)	13.5% (5)	
	5 – Innovation	18.8% (13)	15% (6)	8.1% (3)	
	6 - Sustainability	15.9% (11)	2.5% (1)	0	

## White River – Assessment Knowledge

		Elementary	Middle	High	
<b>Screening Measure Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	4.3% (3)	5% (2)	21.6% (8)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	18.8% (13)	25% (10)	21.6% (8)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	47.8% (33)	22.5% (9)	29.7% (11)	
	4 – Partial Definition	11.6% (8)	20% (8)	13.5% (5)	
	5 – Full Definition	17.4% (12)	27.5% (11)	13.5% (5)	

<b>Progress Monitoring Definitions</b>	0 – No Response	10.1% (7)	7.5% (3)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	1 – Other/Off Topic	0	0	0	
	2 – Incorrect Definition	7.2% (5)	22.5% (9)	16.2% (6)	
	3 – Broad/Vague Definition	39.1% (27)	32.5% (13)	40.5% (15)	
	4 – Partial Definition	36.2% (25)	30% (12)	13.5% (5)	
	5 – Full Definition	7.2% (5)	7.5% (3)	10.8% (4)	

### White River – Assessment Frequency (Scale: 1 – 5)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	<i>1 = never</i>	1.4% (1)	5% (2)	27% (10)	% (N)
	<i>2 = once</i>	0	5% (2)	0	
	<i>3 = twice</i>	0	5% (2)	18.9% (7)	
	<i>4 = three times</i>	46.4% (32)	17.5% (7)	16.2% (6)	
	<i>5 = more than 3 times</i>	47.8% (33)	55% (22)	24.3% (9)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	<i>1 = never</i>	8.7% (6)	17.5% (7)	32.4% (12)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	10.1% (7)	12.5% (5)	8.1% (3)	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	11.6% (8)	12.5% (5)	8.1% (3)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	42% (29)	12.5% (5)	10.8% (4)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	20.3% (14)	27.5% (11)	5.4% (2)	
How often are progress monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	<i>1 = never</i>	10.1% (7)	35% (14)	40.5% (15)	
	<i>2 = 6 weeks</i>	10.1% (7)	0	0	
	<i>3 = 4/5 weeks</i>	4.3% (3)	0	8.1% (3)	
	<i>4 = 2/3 weeks</i>	26.1% (18)	15% (6)	16.2% (6)	
	<i>5 = weekly or more often</i>	37.7% (26)	27.5% (11)	5.4% (2)	
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g. to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	<i>1 = never</i>	10.1% (7)	32.5% (13)	51.4% (19)	
	<i>2 = 1 or 2 data points</i>	7.2% (5)	27.5% (11)	10.8% (4)	
	<i>3 = 3 to 5 data points</i>	42% (29)	22.5% (9)	16.2% (6)	
	<i>4 = 6 data points</i>	17.4% (12)	0	0	
	<i>5 = &gt;6 data points</i>	4.3% (3)	0	2.7% (1)	
How often is data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	<i>1 = never</i>	2.9% (2)	12.5% (5)	32.4% (12)	
	<i>2 = 3 times per year</i>	27.5% (19)	47.5% (19)	18.9% (7)	
	<i>3 = 6 weeks</i>	43.5% (30)	7.5% (3)	2.7% (1)	
	<i>4 = monthly</i>	11.6% (8)	10% (4)	18.9% (7)	
	<i>5 = &gt;monthly</i>	7.2% (5)	20% (8)	10.8% (4)	

### White River – Professional Development Frequency (Scale: 1 – 4)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
In the past year, how many professional development activities have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	<i>1 = none</i>	10.1% (7)	20% (8)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	<i>2 = 1 or 2</i>	53.6% (37)	55% (22)	59.5% (22)	
	<i>3 = 3 or 4</i>	21.7% (15)	20% (8)	8.1% (3)	
	<i>4 = 5 or more</i>	11.6% (8)	5% (2)	2.7% (1)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	<i>0</i>	7.2% (5)	12.5% (5)	27% (10)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	2.5% (1)	5.4% (2)	
	<i>2</i>	4.3% (3)	10% (4)	13.5% (5)	
	<i>3</i>	56.5% (39)	42.5% (17)	37.8% (14)	
	<i>4</i>	31.9% (22)	32.5% (13)	13.5% (5)	
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	<i>0</i>	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	5.4% (2)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	5% (2)	8.1% (3)	
	<i>2</i>	0	0	13.5% (5)	
	<i>3</i>	52.2% (36)	52.5% (21)	62.2% (23)	
	<i>4</i>	46.4% (32)	40% (16)	8.1% (3)	
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	<i>0</i>	2.9% (2)	7.5% (3)	16.2% (6)	% (N)
	<i>1</i>	0	0	2.7% (1)	
	<i>2</i>	4.3% (3)	20% (8)	18.9% (7)	
	<i>3</i>	81.2% (56)	62.5% (25)	59.5% (22)	
	<i>4</i>	11.6% (8)	10% (4)	0	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system in place to ensure that all instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) is being delivered with fidelity (i.e., faithfully, or as it was intended by the creator, developer or publisher).	0	5.8% (4)	7.5% (3)	27% (10)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	10.8% (4)	
	2	18.8% (13)	20% (8)	29.7% (11)	
	3	65.2% (45)	52.5% (21)	27% (10)	
	4	8.7% (6)	10% (4)	2.7% (1)	
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	0	10.1% (7)	12.5% (5)	29.7% (11)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	0	5.4% (2)	
	2	14.5% (10)	22.5% (9)	24.3% (9)	
	3	63.8% (44)	52.5% (21)	37.8% (14)	
	4	8.7% (6)	10% (4)	0	
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	0	0	0	10.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	15% (6)	16.2% (6)	
	2	14.5% (10)	12.5% (5)	29.7% (11)	
	3	53.6% (37)	55% (22)	37.8% (14)	
	4	29% (20)	17.5% (7)	2.7% (1)	
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	0	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	8.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	10.8% (4)	
	2	4.3% (3)	25% (10)	27% (10)	
	3	69.6% (48)	50% (20)	45.9% (17)	
	4	24.6% (17)	20% (8)	2.7% (1)	
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	0	0	5% (2)	5.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	5% (2)	13.5% (5)	
	2	1.4% (1)	0	5.4% (2)	
	3	53.6% (37)	42.5% (17)	48.6% (18)	
	4	42% (29)	47.5% (19)	24.3% (9)	

## White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	0	4.3% (3)	15% (6)	16.2% (6)	% (N)
	1	7.2% (5)	7.5% (3)	8.1% (3)	
	2	18.8% (13)	17.5% (7)	5.4% (2)	
	3	40.6% (28)	25% (10)	56.8% (21)	
	4	29% (20)	35% (14)	10.8% (4)	
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	0	13% (9)	5% (2)	16.2% (6)	% (N)
	1	2.9% (2)	0	2.7% (1)	
	2	8.7% (6)	15% (6)	16.2% (6)	
	3	52.2% (36)	47.5% (19)	56.8% (21)	
	4	23.2% (16)	30% (12)	5.4% (2)	
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	0	1.4% (1)	7.5% (3)	10.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	5.4% (2)	
	2	4.3% (3)	22.5% (9)	35.1% (13)	
	3	66.7% (46)	50% (20)	43.2% (16)	
	4	27.5% (19)	15% (6)	2.7% (1)	
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	0	1.4% (1)	5% (2)	8.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	0	0	
	2	10.1% (7)	25% (10)	35.1% (13)	
	3	66.7% (46)	55% (22)	54.1% (20)	
	4	20.3% (14)	15% (6)	0	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined, grade-level benchmarks (i.e., cut scores, goals/targets, or percentiles) that are used to determine which students are at risk.	0	1.4% (1)	7.5% (3)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	1	0	0	8.1% (3)	
	2	2.9% (2)	17.5% (7)	32.4% (12)	
	3	60.9% (42)	47.5% (19)	29.7% (11)	
	4	34.8% (24)	27.5% (11)	5.4% (2)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core & interventions).	0	8.7% (6)	10% (4)	29.7% (11)	% (N)
	1	4.3% (3)	7.5% (3)	5.4% (2)	
	2	15.9% (11)	35% (14)	32.4% (12)	
	3	56.5% (39)	37.5% (15)	29.7% (11)	
	4	14.5% (10)	5% (2)	0	
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	0	10.1% (7)	17.5% (7)	40.5% (15)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	2.7% (1)	
	2	4.3% (3)	22.5% (9)	27% (10)	
	3	63.8% (44)	40% (16)	24.3% (9)	
	4	20.3% (14)	12.5% (5)	0	
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	13% (9)	7.5% (3)	37.8% (14)	% (N)
	1	4.3% (3)	5% (2)	8.1% (3)	
	2	8.7% (6)	10% (4)	27% (10)	
	3	59.4% (41)	60% (24)	24.3% (9)	
	4	14.5% (10)	17.5% (7)	0	
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	0	2.9% (2)	0	16.2% (6)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	0	
	2	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	13.5% (5)	
	3	62.3% (43)	55% (22)	54.1% (20)	
	4	31.9% (22)	40% (16)	13.5% (5)	
I am able to interpret assessment data.	0	1.4% (1)	5% (2)	8.1% (3)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	2.7% (1)	
	2	0	7.5% (3)	5.4% (2)	
	3	58% (40)	37.5% (15)	59.5% (22)	
	4	40.6% (28)	47.5% (19)	16.2% (6)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	0	4.3% (3)	2.5% (1)	16.2% (6)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	2.7% (1)	
	2	0	2.5% (1)	8.1% (3)	
	3	56.5% (39)	45% (18)	45.9% (17)	
	4	39.1% (27)	47.5% (19)	21.6% (8)	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	0	4.3% (3)	25% (10)	45.9% (17)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	10.8% (4)	
	2	14.5% (10)	20% (8)	21.6% (8)	
	3	60.9% (42)	42.5% (17)	18.9% (7)	
	4	18.8% (13)	5% (2)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	0	7.2% (5)	17.5% (7)	45.9% (17)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	0	10.8% (4)	
	2	13% (9)	15% (6)	18.9% (7)	
	3	62.3% (43)	50% (20)	21.6% (8)	
	4	15.9% (11)	10% (4)	0	
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	0	2.9% (2)	12.5% (5)	45.9% (17)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	8.1% (3)	
	2	7.2% (5)	12.5% (5)	16.2% (6)	
	3	72.5% (50)	55% (22)	21.6% (8)	
	4	14.5% (10)	15% (6)	2.7% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	0	5.8% (4)	12.5% (5)	54.1% (20)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	8.1% (3)	
	2	5.8% (4)	20% (8)	18.9% (7)	
	3	73.9% (51)	52.5% (21)	10.8% (4)	
	4	13% (9)	12.5% (5)	5.4% (2)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	0	4.3% (3)	7.5% (3)	54.1% (20)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	8.1% (3)	
	2	13% (9)	45% (18)	29.7% (11)	
	3	68.1% (47)	25% (10)	5.4% (2)	
	4	11.6% (8)	15% (6)	0	
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	0	20.3% (14)	35% (14)	70.3% (26)	% (N)
	1	2.9% (2)	0	8.1% (3)	
	2	13% (9)	12.5% (5)	2.7% (1)	
	3	52.2% (36)	45% (18)	13.5% (5)	
	4	5.8% (4)	5% (2)	0	
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	0	4.3% (3)	7.5% (3)	16.2% (6)	% (N)
	1	5.8% (4)	2.5% (1)	13.5% (5)	
	2	14.5% (10)	22.5% (9)	32.4% (12)	
	3	59.4% (41)	50% (20)	32.4% (12)	
	4	13% (9)	17.5% (7)	2.7% (1)	
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	0	1.4% (1)	5% (2)	10.8% (4)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	10.8% (4)	
	2	8.7% (6)	12.5% (5)	13.5% (5)	
	3	76.8% (53)	60% (24)	59.5% (22)	
	4	8.7% (6)	17.5% (7)	2.7% (1)	
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	0	8.7% (6)	15% (6)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	5% (2)	8.1% (3)	
	2	20.3% (14)	25% (10)	13.5% (5)	
	3	60.9% (42)	37.5% (15)	54.1% (20)	
	4	7.2% (5)	12.5% (5)	2.7% (1)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	0	5.8% (4)	10% (4)	32.4% (12)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.5% (3)	18.9% (7)	
	2	14.5% (10)	32.5% (13)	8.1% (3)	
	3	66.7% (46)	32.5% (13)	32.4% (12)	
	4	10.1% (7)	15% (6)	2.7% (1)	
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	0	14.5% (10)	20% (8)	37.8% (14)	% (N)
	1	0	5% (2)	10.8% (4)	
	2	2.9% (2)	27.5% (11)	18.9% (7)	
	3	76.8% (53)	27.5% (11)	27% (10)	
	4	4.3% (3)	12.5% (5)	2.7% (1)	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	0	0	0	13.5% (5)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	2.7% (1)	
	2	0	2.5% (1)	2.7% (1)	
	3	52.2% (36)	55% (22)	51.4% (19)	
	4	46.4% (32)	40% (16)	27% (10)	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	0	2.9% (2)	17.5% (7)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.5% (3)	8.1% (3)	
	2	11.6% (8)	17.5% (7)	16.2% (6)	
	3	60.9% (42)	37.5% (15)	54.1% (20)	
	4	21.7% (15)	15% (6)	0	
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	0	0	0	5.4% (2)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	2.7% (1)	
	2	0	0	8.1% (3)	
	3	46.4% (32)	45% (18)	51.4% (19)	
	4	52.2% (36)	52.5% (21)	29.7% (11)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
There is a system (e.g., an “intervention team”) in place for me to access help with classroom management.	0	2.9% (2)	7.5% (3)	21.6% (8)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	7.5% (3)	10.8% (4)	
	2	10.1% (7)	15% (6)	18.9% (7)	
	3	65.2% (45)	55% (22)	37.8% (14)	
	4	18.8% (13)	10% (4)	8.1% (3)	
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	0	15.9% (11)	15% (6)	43.2% (16)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	10% (4)	8.1% (3)	
	2	14.5% (10)	22.5% (9)	16.2% (6)	
	3	53.6% (37)	40% (16)	27% (10)	
	4	11.6% (8)	12.5% (5)	2.7% (1)	
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	0	1.4% (1)	15% (6)	18.9% (7)	% (N)
	1	0	2.5% (1)	10.8% (4)	
	2	4.3% (3)	22.5% (9)	27% (10)	
	3	71% (49)	42.5% (17)	40.5% (15)	
	4	21.7% (15)	17.5% (7)	0	
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	0	10.1% (7)	22.5% (9)	29.7% (11)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	2.5% (1)	10.8% (4)	
	2	4.3% (3)	22.5% (9)	27% (10)	
	3	60.9% (42)	32.5% (13)	27% (10)	
	4	20.3% (14)	17.5% (7)	2.7% (1)	

### White River – Implementation Coherence, Continued

(Scale: 0 = Don't Know; 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree)

		Elementary	Middle	High	
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	0	21.7% (15)	42.5% (17)	54.1% (20)	% (N)
	1	1.4% (1)	0	8.1% (3)	
	2	8.7% (6)	12.5% (5)	13.5% (5)	
	3	56.5% (39)	30% (12)	21.6% (8)	
	4	10.1% (7)	10% (4)	0	
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	0	47.8% (33)	70% (28)	78.4% (29)	% (N)
	1	2.9% (2)	2.5% (1)	0	
	2	8.7% (6)	17.5% (7)	5.4% (2)	
	3	30.4% (21)	7.5% (3)	10.8% (4)	
	4	7.2% (5)	0	2.7% (1)	
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	0	49.3% (34)	80% (32)	81.1% (30)	% (N)
	1	2.9% (2)	2.5% (1)	0	
	2	4.3% (3)	5% (2)	2.7% (1)	
	3	31.9% (22)	10% (4)	10.8% (4)	
	4	8.7% (6)	0	2.7% (1)	

**White River – Efficacy and Expectancy**  
**(Scale: 1 = Increased; 2 = No Change; 3 = Decreased)**

		Elementary	Middle	High	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your ability to meet the needs of all of your students?	1	44.9% (31)	22.5% (9)	21.6% (8)	% (N)
	2	50.7% (35)	77.5% (31)	70.3% (26)	
	3	2.9% (2)	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your confidence in your school's ability to meet the needs of all students?	1	53.6% (37)	52.5% (21)	27% (10)	% (N)
	2	44.9% (31)	47.5% (19)	62.2% (23)	
	3	0	0	2.7% (1)	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your expectations for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	47.8% (33)	25% (10)	32.4% (12)	% (N)
	2	50.7% (35)	75% (30)	56.8% (21)	
	3	0	0	0	
How do you think implementing RTI has changed expectations at your school for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	1	58% (40)	42.5% (17)	35.1% (13)	% (N)
	2	40.6% (28)	57.5% (23)	54.1% (20)	
	3	0	0	0	