

# **Appendix H**

---

**Spring 2010  
Summaries of Survey Results  
by Implementing**

## East Valley – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 247	14	(5.7%)	233	(94.3%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	15.08	7.1	(27)	17.22	9.7	(37)
Years at current school	7.77	4.2	(10)	11.58	8.5	(34)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	9.42	5.7	(21)	10.47	8.2	(31)

## East Valley by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	13	(100.0%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	7	(100.0%)
Bachelor's Degree	2	(3.9%)	49	(96.1%)
Master's Degree	9	(5.7%)	149	(94.3%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	2	(100.0%)
Other	3	(20.0%)	12	(80.0%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	12	(6.3%)	177	(93.7%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	3	(7.5%)	37	(92.5%)
Other Certification – Yes	10	(9.5%)	95	(90.5%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	11	(7.1%)	143	(92.9%)
Mathematics	9	(6.4%)	131	(93.6%)
Science	7	(7.2%)	90	(92.8%)
Social Studies	11	(10.1%)	98	(89.9%)
Behavior	7	(7.0%)	93	(93.0%)
Written Language	12	(9.3%)	117	(90.7%)
Other	1	(1.5%)	64	(98.5%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	10	(6.0%)	158	(94.0%)
Tier II	13	(9.2%)	129	(90.8%)
Tier III	10	(11.2%)	79	(88.8%)
Accelerated	5	(15.2%)	28	(84.8%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	10	(100.0%)

### East Valley by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	33	(100.0%)
Reading	10	(6.9%)	134	(93.1%)
Mathematics	10	(9.4%)	96	(90.6%)
Science	3	(12.5%)	21	(87.5%)
Social Studies	4	(13.8%)	25	(86.2%)
Behavior	6	(7.1%)	79	(92.9%)
Written Language	8	(10.3%)	70	(89.7%)
Other	1	(4.3%)	22	(95.7%)

## East Valley by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	11	(5.9%)	177	(94.1%)
Specialized teacher	10	(8.3%)	111	(91.7%)
Paraprofessional	11	(11.1%)	88	(88.9%)
Parent volunteer	9	(26.5%)	25	(73.5%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	5	(100.0%)
Other	3	(10.0%)	27	(90.0%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	34	(100.0%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	41	(100.0%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	17	(100.0%)
3 - Initial Implementation	9	(14.8%)	52	(85.2%)
4 - Full Implementation	1	(2.7%)	36	(97.3%)
5 - Innovation	4	(12.9%)	27	(87.1%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	17	(100.0%)

## East Valley by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	3	(4.3%)	66	(95.7%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	2	(3.7%)	52	(96.3%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	2	(4.8%)	40	(95.2%)
	Partial Definition	5	(12.2%)	36	(87.8%)
	Full Definition	2	(5.3%)	36	(94.7%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	52	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	2	(3.4%)	56	(96.6%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	6	(8.2%)	67	(91.8%)
	Partial Definition	4	(9.5%)	38	(90.5%)
	Full Definition	2	(10.0%)	18	(90.0%)

## East Valley by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	52	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Twice	11	(15.7%)	59	(84.3%)
	Three times	3	(7.9%)	35	(92.1%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	2	(2.9%)	67	(97.1%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	5	(15.2%)	28	(84.8%)
	Every four to five weeks	2	(7.1%)	26	(92.9%)
	Every two to three weeks	2	(4.4%)	43	(95.6%)
	Weekly or more often	3	(5.1%)	56	(94.9%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	100	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	4	(16.7%)	20	(83.3%)
	Every four to five weeks	5	(38.5%)	8	(61.5%)
	Every two to three weeks	2	(6.5%)	29	(93.5%)
	Weekly or more often	3	(4.7%)	61	(95.3%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	2	(2.6%)	75	(97.4%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	2	(7.7%)	24	(92.3%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	5	(13.2%)	33	(86.8%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	2	(2.6%)	74	(97.4%)
	When six data points have been collected	2	(15.4%)	11	(84.6%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	1	(11.1%)	8	(88.9%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	I don't know	2	(2.9%)	68	(97.1%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	8	(10.7%)	67	(89.3%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	3	(9.1%)	30	(90.9%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	More often than once per month	1	(4.0%)	24	(96.0%)

## East Valley by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	3	(3.6%)	80	(96.4%)
	One or two	5	(4.9%)	97	(95.1%)
	Three or four	5	(10.6%)	42	(89.4%)
	Five or more	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)

## East Valley by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Agree	5	(4.3%)	110	(95.7%)
	Strongly Agree	9	(15.5%)	49	(84.5%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	3	(3.2%)	92	(96.8%)
	Strongly Agree	11	(9.2%)	108	(90.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Agree	4	(3.6%)	107	(96.4%)
	Strongly Agree	10	(10.3%)	87	(89.7%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Agree	8	(6.3%)	120	(93.8%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(9.4%)	58	(90.6%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	Agree	9	(9.6%)	85	(90.4%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(7.9%)	58	(92.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.7%)	36	(97.3%)
	Agree	6	(6.3%)	90	(93.8%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(10.7%)	50	(89.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.6%)	38	(97.4%)
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Agree	6	(5.4%)	105	(94.6%)
	Strongly Agree	7	(8.9%)	72	(91.1%)
	Don't Know	1	(16.7%)	5	(83.3%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	5	(6.9%)	67	(93.1%)
	Strongly Agree	9	(6.8%)	123	(93.2%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Agree	5	(7.1%)	65	(92.9%)
	Strongly Agree	7	(5.8%)	114	(94.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.9%)	16	(94.1%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Agree	5	(5.4%)	88	(94.6%)
	Strongly Agree	9	(8.3%)	100	(91.7%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Agree	6	(6.3%)	90	(93.8%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(8.7%)	84	(91.3%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.4%)	40	(97.6%)
	Agree	8	(6.5%)	116	(93.5%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(7.4%)	63	(92.6%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Agree	4	(3.8%)	100	(96.2%)
	Strongly Agree	10	(11.2%)	79	(88.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(1.9%)	53	(98.1%)
	Agree	7	(7.2%)	90	(92.8%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(7.7%)	48	(92.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.6%)	27	(96.4%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Agree	5	(4.8%)	99	(95.2%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(10.5%)	68	(89.5%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.2%)	30	(96.8%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Agree	4	(3.8%)	100	(96.2%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(10.1%)	71	(89.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	6	(5.1%)	111	(94.9%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(8.2%)	89	(91.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	6	(5.6%)	102	(94.4%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(7.8%)	95	(92.2%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Agree	5	(5.0%)	96	(95.0%)
	Strongly Agree	9	(7.9%)	105	(92.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Agree	6	(6.2%)	91	(93.8%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(14.0%)	49	(86.0%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Agree	9	(8.3%)	99	(91.7%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(11.6%)	38	(88.4%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	7	(6.4%)	103	(93.6%)
	Strongly Agree	7	(13.2%)	46	(86.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	5	(5.3%)	89	(94.7%)
	Strongly Agree	9	(13.2%)	59	(86.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.7%)	26	(96.3%)
	Agree	6	(6.3%)	89	(93.7%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(13.6%)	38	(86.4%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.5%)	65	(98.5%)
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	2	(6.9%)	27	(93.1%)
	Agree	4	(4.2%)	91	(95.8%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(10.7%)	25	(89.3%)
	Don't Know	4	(4.9%)	78	(95.1%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Agree	9	(7.5%)	111	(92.5%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(8.5%)	54	(91.5%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)
	Agree	7	(6.1%)	108	(93.9%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(8.6%)	64	(91.4%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Agree	4	(4.6%)	83	(95.4%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(14.0%)	49	(86.0%)
	Don't Know	2	(4.0%)	48	(96.0%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.9%)	34	(97.1%)
	Agree	6	(6.6%)	85	(93.4%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(11.1%)	48	(88.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.3%)	43	(97.7%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Agree	6	(7.1%)	78	(92.9%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(9.1%)	50	(90.9%)
	Don't Know	3	(5.3%)	54	(94.7%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	3	(3.9%)	73	(96.1%)
	Strongly Agree	10	(6.8%)	138	(93.2%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Agree	6	(6.7%)	84	(93.3%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(8.5%)	86	(91.5%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	2	(2.5%)	78	(97.5%)
	Strongly Agree	12	(7.8%)	141	(92.2%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.8%)	35	(97.2%)
	Agree	8	(8.1%)	91	(91.9%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(6.8%)	68	(93.2%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Agree	7	(8.2%)	78	(91.8%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(8.6%)	64	(91.4%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.0%)	49	(98.0%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Agree	5	(5.7%)	83	(94.3%)
	Strongly Agree	7	(9.1%)	70	(90.9%)
	Don't Know	2	(4.4%)	43	(95.6%)
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.2%)	23	(95.8%)
	Agree	5	(6.4%)	73	(93.6%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(9.4%)	58	(90.6%)
	Don't Know	2	(2.9%)	66	(97.1%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
	Agree	4	(4.9%)	77	(95.1%)
	Strongly Agree	5	(10.2%)	44	(89.8%)
	Don't Know	4	(4.5%)	85	(95.5%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)
	Disagree	2	(10.5%)	17	(89.5%)
	Agree	3	(5.8%)	49	(94.2%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(9.4%)	29	(90.6%)
	Don't Know	5	(3.8%)	126	(96.2%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Agree	3	(5.7%)	50	(94.3%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(15.4%)	22	(84.6%)
	Don't Know	5	(3.5%)	136	(96.5%)

## East Valley by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	9	(9.0%)	91	(91.0%)
	No Change	4	(3.1%)	126	(96.9%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	11	(8.4%)	120	(91.6%)
	No Change	3	(3.2%)	91	(96.8%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	7	(6.9%)	94	(93.1%)
	No Change	6	(4.9%)	117	(95.1%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	8	(6.6%)	113	(93.4%)
	No Change	6	(5.9%)	96	(94.1%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)

## Hoquiam – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 91	15	(16.5%)	76	(83.5%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	12.69	8.8	(32)	15.78	8.9	(39)
Years at current school	7.00	5.7	(15)	9.80	8.7	(35)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	7.33	5.5	(15)	9.81	8.9	(36)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Bachelor's Degree	7	(25.9%)	20	(74.1%)
Master's Degree	7	(16.7%)	35	(83.3%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	11	(20.0%)	44	(80.0%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	3	(33.3%)	6	(66.7%)
Other Certification – Yes	4	(18.2%)	18	(81.8%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	7	(11.7%)	53	(88.3%)
Mathematics	2	(4.5%)	42	(95.5%)
Science	3	(10.3%)	26	(89.7%)
Social Studies	6	(20.7%)	23	(79.3%)
Behavior	2	(5.0%)	38	(95.0%)
Written Language	7	(17.1%)	34	(82.9%)
Other	2	(11.8%)	15	(88.2%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	12	(19.4%)	50	(80.6%)
Tier II	2	(5.0%)	38	(95.0%)
Tier III	1	(3.1%)	31	(96.9%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	5	(22.7%)	17	(77.3%)
Reading	6	(10.7%)	50	(89.3%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Social Studies	2	(66.7%)	1	(33.3%)
Behavior	2	(8.0%)	23	(92.0%)
Written Language	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
Other	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	9	(14.1%)	55	(85.9%)
Specialized teacher	4	(10.5%)	34	(89.5%)
Paraprofessional	3	(6.8%)	41	(93.2%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Other	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	4	(16.7%)	20	(83.3%)
1 - Exploration	5	(38.5%)	8	(61.5%)
2 - Installation	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
3 - Initial Implementation	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
6 - Sustainability	2	(16.7%)	10	(83.3%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	3	(13.0%)	20	(87.0%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	5	(20.0%)	20	(80.0%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	2	(13.3%)	13	(86.7%)
	Partial Definition	3	(21.4%)	11	(78.6%)
	Full Definition	1	(9.1%)	10	(90.9%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	3	(14.3%)	18	(85.7%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	7	(41.2%)	10	(58.8%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	3	(11.5%)	23	(88.5%)
	Partial Definition	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	4	(14.8%)	23	(85.2%)
	None	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Once	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Twice	5	(20.0%)	20	(80.0%)
	Three times	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)
	More than 3 times	2	(10.0%)	18	(90.0%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	10	(30.3%)	23	(69.7%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	1	(11.1%)	8	(88.9%)
	Every four to five weeks	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Every two to three weeks	1	(2.6%)	37	(97.4%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	10	(27.0%)	27	(73.0%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	2	(5.9%)	32	(94.1%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	8	(21.6%)	29	(78.4%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	3	(9.1%)	30	(90.9%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	I don't know	8	(22.2%)	28	(77.8%)
	Never	1	(50.0%)	1	(50.0%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	1	(5.0%)	19	(95.0%)
	Once per month or less frequently	3	(15.8%)	16	(84.2%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	8	(26.7%)	22	(73.3%)
	One or two	3	(8.8%)	31	(91.2%)
	Three or four	1	(5.9%)	16	(94.1%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	3	(30.0%)	7	(70.0%)
	Agree	6	(15.8%)	32	(84.2%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
	Don't Know	3	(13.0%)	20	(87.0%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
	Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Agree	10	(25.0%)	30	(75.0%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(4.9%)	39	(95.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Disagree	4	(44.4%)	5	(55.6%)
	Agree	6	(14.0%)	37	(86.0%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(6.7%)	28	(93.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Disagree	7	(43.8%)	9	(56.3%)
	Agree	4	(7.7%)	48	(92.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	7	(43.8%)	9	(56.3%)
	Agree	5	(14.7%)	29	(85.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(3.7%)	26	(96.3%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Agree	10	(25.0%)	30	(75.0%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(8.7%)	21	(91.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(50.0%)	2	(50.0%)
	Agree	9	(19.6%)	37	(80.4%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(8.1%)	34	(91.9%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Agree	8	(16.7%)	40	(83.3%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(12.9%)	27	(87.1%)
	Don't Know	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	5	(31.3%)	11	(68.8%)
	Agree	6	(16.7%)	30	(83.3%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(12.0%)	22	(88.0%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	3	(21.4%)	11	(78.6%)
	Agree	8	(19.5%)	33	(80.5%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(7.1%)	26	(92.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	4	(26.7%)	11	(73.3%)
	Agree	8	(18.6%)	35	(81.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(4.0%)	24	(96.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	9	(39.1%)	14	(60.9%)
	Agree	5	(11.4%)	39	(88.6%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Agree	9	(27.3%)	24	(72.7%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(8.5%)	43	(91.5%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	3	(18.8%)	13	(81.3%)
	Agree	8	(20.0%)	32	(80.0%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(8.3%)	22	(91.7%)
	Don't Know	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Disagree	3	(33.3%)	6	(66.7%)
	Agree	6	(14.0%)	37	(86.0%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(7.4%)	25	(92.6%)
	Don't Know	2	(28.6%)	5	(71.4%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(25.0%)	6	(75.0%)
	Agree	7	(20.6%)	27	(79.4%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(6.5%)	29	(93.5%)
	Don't Know	3	(25.0%)	9	(75.0%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(40.0%)	3	(60.0%)
	Agree	10	(21.7%)	36	(78.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(3.0%)	32	(97.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	4	(50.0%)	4	(50.0%)
	Agree	7	(14.6%)	41	(85.4%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(10.0%)	27	(90.0%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(40.0%)	3	(60.0%)
	Agree	7	(14.3%)	42	(85.7%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(9.7%)	28	(90.3%)
	Don't Know	2	(66.7%)	1	(33.3%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	5	(31.3%)	11	(68.8%)
	Agree	4	(10.8%)	33	(89.2%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
	Don't Know	4	(25.0%)	12	(75.0%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	1	(16.7%)	5	(83.3%)
	Disagree	4	(30.8%)	9	(69.2%)
	Agree	2	(5.3%)	36	(94.7%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
	Don't Know	6	(33.3%)	12	(66.7%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	4	(33.3%)	8	(66.7%)
	Agree	4	(10.8%)	33	(89.2%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(5.3%)	18	(94.7%)
	Don't Know	5	(27.8%)	13	(72.2%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Agree	7	(16.7%)	35	(83.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
	Don't Know	4	(26.7%)	11	(73.3%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	5	(33.3%)	10	(66.7%)
	Agree	3	(8.6%)	32	(91.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
	Don't Know	5	(29.4%)	12	(70.6%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	4	(36.4%)	7	(63.6%)
	Agree	4	(10.5%)	34	(89.5%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	6	(23.1%)	20	(76.9%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)
	Disagree	3	(20.0%)	12	(80.0%)
	Agree	7	(15.2%)	39	(84.8%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
	Don't Know	2	(28.6%)	5	(71.4%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Disagree	2	(14.3%)	12	(85.7%)
	Agree	8	(17.0%)	39	(83.0%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(10.0%)	18	(90.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	2	(28.6%)	5	(71.4%)
	Disagree	3	(17.6%)	14	(82.4%)
	Agree	6	(14.6%)	35	(85.4%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Don't Know	3	(37.5%)	5	(62.5%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	2	(25.0%)	6	(75.0%)
	Disagree	3	(21.4%)	11	(78.6%)
	Agree	6	(14.3%)	36	(85.7%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Don't Know	2	(25.0%)	6	(75.0%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	2	(28.6%)	5	(71.4%)
	Disagree	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)
	Agree	3	(8.6%)	32	(91.4%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(15.0%)	17	(85.0%)
	Don't Know	5	(26.3%)	14	(73.7%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
	Agree	4	(8.7%)	42	(91.3%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(21.1%)	30	(78.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(50.0%)	1	(50.0%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(12.5%)	14	(87.5%)
	Agree	5	(15.2%)	28	(84.8%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(11.5%)	23	(88.5%)
	Don't Know	4	(33.3%)	8	(66.7%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	5	(11.9%)	37	(88.1%)
	Strongly Agree	8	(17.8%)	37	(82.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(100%)	0	(.0%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	2	(50.0%)	2	(50.0%)
	Disagree	2	(13.3%)	13	(86.7%)
	Agree	7	(17.1%)	34	(82.9%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(5.0%)	19	(95.0%)
	Don't Know	2	(20.0%)	8	(80.0%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	6	(40.0%)	9	(60.0%)
	Agree	5	(13.2%)	33	(86.8%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(5.0%)	19	(95.0%)
	Don't Know	2	(15.4%)	11	(84.6%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	7	(43.8%)	9	(56.3%)
	Agree	2	(5.6%)	34	(94.4%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(8.0%)	23	(92.0%)
	Don't Know	2	(25.0%)	6	(75.0%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	1	(16.7%)	5	(83.3%)
	Disagree	6	(40.0%)	9	(60.0%)
	Agree	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(4.8%)	20	(95.2%)
	Don't Know	5	(26.3%)	14	(73.7%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	5	(55.6%)	4	(44.4%)
	Agree	1	(3.2%)	30	(96.8%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Don't Know	8	(22.2%)	28	(77.8%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(25.0%)	6	(75.0%)
	Agree	3	(15.0%)	17	(85.0%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(16.7%)	5	(83.3%)
	Don't Know	8	(14.8%)	46	(85.2%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Agree	3	(14.3%)	18	(85.7%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	10	(17.5%)	47	(82.5%)

## Hoquiam by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	No Change	13	(28.9%)	32	(71.1%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	5	(10.0%)	45	(90.0%)
	No Change	7	(20.6%)	27	(79.4%)
	Less Confident	2	(66.7%)	1	(33.3%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	3	(6.8%)	41	(93.2%)
	No Change	10	(23.8%)	32	(76.2%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	2	(4.4%)	43	(95.6%)
	No Change	12	(28.6%)	30	(71.4%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 58	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	.	.	.	14.83	8.3	(35)
Years at current school	.	.	.	10.96	7.9	(30)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	.	.	.	10.10	9.0	(36)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Bachelor's Degree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Master's Degree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Other Certification – Yes	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	0	(.0%)	38	(100%)
Tier II	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
Tier III	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)

### Kiona-Benton by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
Reading	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
Specialized teacher	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Paraprofessional	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
3 - Initial Implementation	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	41	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	45	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)

## Kiona-Benton by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

## Longview – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 337	4	(1.2%)	333	(98.8%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	22.25	11.3	(24)	17.95	9.9	(39)
Years at current school	1.25	.5	(1)	10.04	8.1	(33)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	4.00	3.2	(7)	9.89	8.7	(40)

## Longview by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	15	(100.0%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	4	(100.0%)
Bachelor's Degree	0	(.0%)	73	(100.0%)
Master's Degree	2	(.9%)	222	(99.1%)
Doctorate	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
Other	1	(7.7%)	12	(92.3%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	3	(1.1%)	278	(98.9%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	55	(100.0%)
Other Certification – Yes	2	(1.4%)	138	(98.6%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	1	(.5%)	206	(99.5%)
Mathematics	2	(1.2%)	168	(98.8%)
Science	1	(.8%)	124	(99.2%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	119	(100.0%)
Behavior	2	(1.5%)	135	(98.5%)
Written Language	1	(.6%)	174	(99.4%)
Other	2	(1.9%)	102	(98.1%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	1	(.4%)	248	(99.6%)
Tier II	1	(.6%)	165	(99.4%)
Tier III	1	(.8%)	126	(99.2%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	69	(100.0%)
Other Tier	1	(4.2%)	23	(95.8%)

### Longview by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	2	(4.3%)	44	(95.7%)
Reading	1	(.5%)	196	(99.5%)
Mathematics	1	(.7%)	140	(99.3%)
Science	1	(2.4%)	40	(97.6%)
Social Studies	1	(2.4%)	40	(97.6%)
Behavior	1	(1.1%)	93	(98.9%)
Written Language	1	(.9%)	110	(99.1%)
Other	0	(.0%)	31	(100.0%)

## Longview by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	3	(1.2%)	251	(98.8%)
Specialized teacher	1	(.8%)	117	(99.2%)
Paraprofessional	1	(.8%)	131	(99.2%)
Parent volunteer	1	(2.4%)	41	(97.6%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	10	(100.0%)
Other	1	(3.7%)	26	(96.3%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	2	(4.4%)	43	(95.6%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	60	(100.0%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	11	(100.0%)
3 - Initial Implementation	1	(1.1%)	93	(98.9%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	39	(100.0%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	54	(100.0%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	19	(100.0%)

## Longview by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	2	(2.9%)	67	(97.1%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	103	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	1	(2.1%)	46	(97.9%)
	Partial Definition	1	(1.3%)	76	(98.7%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	2	(3.5%)	55	(96.5%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	65	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	1	(.9%)	108	(99.1%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	78	(100%)
	Full Definition	1	(4.2%)	23	(95.8%)

## Longview by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	2	(3.4%)	57	(96.6%)
	None	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
	Three times	1	(1.8%)	55	(98.2%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	123	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	2	(2.1%)	92	(97.9%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	1	(1.3%)	74	(98.7%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	72	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	2	(1.5%)	131	(98.5%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	1	(1.1%)	91	(98.9%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	2	(2.4%)	82	(97.6%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	108	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	2	(2.3%)	84	(97.7%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	86	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	44	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	More often than once per month	1	(1.7%)	59	(98.3%)

## Longview by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	2	(1.5%)	135	(98.5%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	116	(100%)
	Three or four	1	(2.4%)	41	(97.6%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)

## Longview by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.7%)	139	(99.3%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.1%)	92	(97.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.6%)	37	(97.4%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	112	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(1.7%)	178	(98.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(14.3%)	6	(85.7%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	162	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(3.5%)	111	(96.5%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.5%)	39	(97.5%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	192	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(3.9%)	74	(96.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(1.6%)	63	(98.4%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	171	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.7%)	59	(98.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(4.0%)	24	(96.0%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	41	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.1%)	173	(98.9%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.3%)	76	(98.7%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.1%)	31	(96.9%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.4%)	143	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(1.4%)	138	(98.6%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	121	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(2.2%)	176	(97.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	74	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	116	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(3.2%)	90	(96.8%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	163	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.1%)	93	(97.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	52	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.5%)	133	(98.5%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(.9%)	110	(99.1%)
	Don't Know	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	72	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	180	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(5.0%)	57	(95.0%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.3%)	155	(98.7%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(.8%)	117	(99.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	85	(100%)
	Agree	3	(2.1%)	143	(97.9%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	56	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.1%)	31	(96.9%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	41	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	173	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.1%)	88	(98.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.3%)	18	(94.7%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.7%)	139	(99.3%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(1.6%)	127	(98.4%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	166	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(2.9%)	133	(97.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	148	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(1.9%)	151	(98.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	136	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(1.9%)	157	(98.1%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	44	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	159	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.6%)	62	(98.4%)
	Don't Know	2	(3.8%)	50	(96.2%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	166	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.3%)	43	(97.7%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.9%)	52	(98.1%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.5%)	184	(99.5%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.8%)	55	(98.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.3%)	43	(97.7%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	48	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	148	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.8%)	70	(97.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.1%)	47	(97.9%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	76	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	132	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(4.2%)	46	(95.8%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.8%)	54	(98.2%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.4%)	143	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.0%)	103	(99.0%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	161	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.5%)	66	(98.5%)
	Don't Know	1	(4.3%)	22	(95.7%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	38	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	166	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.1%)	92	(98.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(1.7%)	59	(98.3%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	145	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.0%)	48	(98.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.7%)	58	(98.3%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	170	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.0%)	50	(98.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.0%)	48	(98.0%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.0%)	49	(98.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	120	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.0%)	50	(98.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.1%)	89	(98.9%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	129	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(2.2%)	180	(97.8%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.6%)	155	(99.4%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.4%)	83	(97.6%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.3%)	18	(94.7%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.4%)	136	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(1.1%)	176	(98.9%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.4%)	140	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.1%)	86	(98.9%)
	Don't Know	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	48	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.7%)	147	(99.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.8%)	55	(98.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.8%)	56	(98.2%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Agree	1	(.5%)	187	(99.5%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.4%)	71	(98.6%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.1%)	31	(96.9%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	165	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(3.8%)	51	(96.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.9%)	52	(98.1%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	45	(100%)
	Agree	2	(1.6%)	126	(98.4%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	41	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(.9%)	105	(99.1%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	53	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.8%)	54	(98.2%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(4.0%)	24	(96.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(.5%)	182	(99.5%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Agree	2	(3.1%)	62	(96.9%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(.5%)	189	(99.5%)

## Longview by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	1	(.7%)	135	(99.3%)
	No Change	2	(1.1%)	180	(98.9%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	1	(.6%)	168	(99.4%)
	No Change	2	(1.4%)	144	(98.6%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	1	(.6%)	161	(99.4%)
	No Change	2	(1.3%)	158	(98.8%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	1	(.6%)	175	(99.4%)
	No Change	2	(1.4%)	142	(98.6%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Odessa – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 28	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	.	.	.	19.54	10.8	(38)
Years at current school	.	.	.	16.04	11.2	(39)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	.	.	.	15.57	11.3	(37)

## Odessa by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Bachelor's Degree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Master's Degree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Other Certification – Yes	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Tier II	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
Tier III	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)

## Odessa by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Reading	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)

## Odessa by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Specialized teacher	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Paraprofessional	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
3 - Initial Implementation	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

## Odessa by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Odessa by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Odessa by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

## Odessa by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)

## Odessa by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

## Richland – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 58	0	(.0%)	508	(100.0%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	.	.	.	14.78	9.3	(41)
Years at current school	.	.	.	7.77	6.8	(34)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	.	.	.	8.50	7.9	(42)

## Richland by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	26	(100.0%)
Associate’s Degree	0	(.0%)	26	(100.0%)
Bachelor’s Degree	0	(.0%)	130	(100.0%)
Master’s Degree	0	(.0%)	296	(100.0%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	1	(100.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	22	(100.0%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	0	(.0%)	389	(100.0%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	72	(100.0%)
Other Certification – Yes	0	(.0%)	204	(100.0%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	0	(.0%)	324	(100.0%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	274	(100.0%)
Science	0	(.0%)	191	(100.0%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	219	(100.0%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	207	(100.0%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	263	(100.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	117	(100.0%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	0	(.0%)	353	(100.0%)
Tier II	0	(.0%)	327	(100.0%)
Tier III	0	(.0%)	241	(100.0%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	103	(100.0%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	33	(100.0%)

### Richland by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	86	(100.0%)
Reading	0	(.0%)	299	(100.0%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	194	(100.0%)
Science	0	(.0%)	30	(100.0%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	30	(100.0%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	99	(100.0%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	97	(100.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	40	(100.0%)

## Richland by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	0	(.0%)	394	(100.0%)
Specialized teacher	0	(.0%)	167	(100.0%)
Paraprofessional	0	(.0%)	252	(100.0%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	59	(100.0%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	4	(100.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	39	(100.0%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	93	(100.0%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	63	(100.0%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	17	(100.0%)
3 - Initial Implementation	0	(.0%)	110	(100.0%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	74	(100.0%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	92	(100.0%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	48	(100.0%)

## Richland by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	128	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	93	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	86	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	122	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	104	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	70	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	130	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	159	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)

## Richland by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	124	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	104	(100%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	72	(100%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	140	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	157	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	76	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	95	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	130	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	205	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	114	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	79	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	0	(.0%)	162	(100%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	114	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	155	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	0	(.0%)	167	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	125	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	100	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)

## Richland by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	0	(.0%)	168	(100.0%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	220	(100.0%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	78	(100.0%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	23	(100.0%)

## Richland by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	209	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	165	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	197	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	237	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	70	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	249	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	147	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	289	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	119	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	99	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	215	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	102	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	93	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	210	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	93	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	77	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	91	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	232	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	115	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	195	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	216	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	175	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	179	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	42	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	226	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	159	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	71	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	229	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	147	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	73	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	274	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	101	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	230	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	173	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	94	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	217	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	93	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	65	(100%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	64	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	232	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	117	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	221	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	160	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	266	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	162	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	252	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	167	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	247	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	162	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	82	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	228	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	84	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	81	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	85	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	207	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	100	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	85	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	240	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	101	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	75	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	231	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	126	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	73	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	88	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	199	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	90	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	95	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	192	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	70	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	168	(100%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	61	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	264	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	110	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	251	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	127	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	91	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	208	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	103	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	74	(100%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	79	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	227	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	99	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	64	(100%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	197	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	86	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	126	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	233	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	224	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	78	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	220	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	143	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	211	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	253	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	223	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	144	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	50	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	66	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	230	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	109	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	70	(100%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	52	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	248	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	121	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	65	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	206	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	111	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	91	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	55	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	180	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	100	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	147	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	131	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	80	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	261	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	118	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	291	(100%)

## Richland by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	235	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	243	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	304	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	163	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	228	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	258	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	297	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	188	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

## Shoreline – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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).

### Shoreline by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 295	0	(.0%)	295	(100%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	.	.	.	15.97	9.6	(43)
Years at current school	.	.	.	8.50	6.9	(35)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	.	.	.	8.21	7.3	(37)

## Shoreline by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
Bachelor's Degree	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)
Master's Degree	0	(.0%)	211	(100%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	0	(.0%)	277	(100%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
Other Certification – Yes	0	(.0%)	117	(100%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	0	(.0%)	207	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	189	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	155	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	157	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	158	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	186	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	79	(100%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	0	(.0%)	234	(100%)
Tier II	0	(.0%)	197	(100%)
Tier III	0	(.0%)	104	(100%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)

### Shoreline by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Reading	0	(.0%)	191	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	125	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	45	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	61	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)

## Shoreline by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	0	(.0%)	250	(100%)
Specialized teacher	0	(.0%)	130	(100%)
Paraprofessional	0	(.0%)	126	(100%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
3 - Initial Implementation	0	(.0%)	108	(100%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)

## Shoreline by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	89	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	81	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	84	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)

## Shoreline by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	56	(100%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	99	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	55	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	52	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	97	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	118	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	0	(.0%)	67	(100%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	91	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	84	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	63	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)

## Shoreline by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	154	(100%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	75	(100%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	38	(100%)

## Shoreline by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	123	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	99	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	141	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	123	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	149	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	74	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	172	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	69	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	85	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	111	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	75	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	112	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	160	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	67	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	138	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	122	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	124	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	95	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	143	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	155	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	157	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	141	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	82	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	106	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	106	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	146	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	141	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	41	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	159	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	94	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	139	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	120	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	138	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	120	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	142	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	42	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	73	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	125	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	154	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	44	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	139	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	71	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	105	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	41	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	102	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	117	(100%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	142	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	50	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	139	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	147	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	142	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	136	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	55	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	135	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	134	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	66	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	129	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	120	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	152	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	66	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	123	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	57	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	144	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	163	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	64	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	45	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	129	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	55	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	48	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	103	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	110	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	205	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	210	(100%)

## Shoreline by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	132	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	144	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	173	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	102	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	114	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	165	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	163	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	112	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 60	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	.	.	.	16.78	9.4	(37)
Years at current school	.	.	.	10.66	7.6	(32)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	.	.	.	11.02	9.2	(33)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Bachelor's Degree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
Master's Degree	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Other Certification – Yes	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
Tier II	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
Tier III	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Other Tier	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)

### Stevenson Carson by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
Reading	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Written Language	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
Specialized teacher	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
Paraprofessional	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
3 - Initial Implementation	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Once	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	0	(.0%)	38	(100%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	42	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	44	(100%)

## Stevenson Carson by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	No Change	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)

## Vancouver – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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).

### Vancouver by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 826	613	(74.2%)	213	(25.8%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	13.87	9.2	(42)	13.84	9.9	(50)
Years at current school	8.01	6.3	(41)	8.55	7.1	(41)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	8.27	7.3	(41)	7.56	6.7	(36)

## Vancouver by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	11	(64.7%)	6	(35.3%)
Associate's Degree	26	(56.5%)	20	(43.5%)
Bachelor's Degree	130	(70.3%)	55	(29.7%)
Master's Degree	402	(76.7%)	122	(23.3%)
Doctorate	4	(80.0%)	1	(20.0%)
Other	33	(78.6%)	9	(21.4%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	505	(76.1%)	159	(23.9%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	92	(80.0%)	23	(20.0%)
Other Certification – Yes	225	(73.3%)	82	(26.7%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	372	(69.1%)	166	(30.9%)
Mathematics	320	(69.6%)	140	(30.4%)
Science	244	(68.7%)	111	(31.3%)
Social Studies	248	(68.5%)	114	(31.5%)
Behavior	224	(65.5%)	118	(34.5%)
Written Language	322	(70.8%)	133	(29.2%)
Other	169	(74.1%)	59	(25.9%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	433	(74.4%)	149	(25.6%)
Tier II	276	(68.3%)	128	(31.7%)
Tier III	195	(69.9%)	84	(30.1%)
Accelerated	73	(68.2%)	34	(31.8%)
Other Tier	19	(79.2%)	5	(20.8%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	195	(75.6%)	63	(24.4%)
Reading	263	(68.7%)	120	(31.3%)
Mathematics	159	(72.3%)	61	(27.7%)
Science	45	(91.8%)	4	(8.2%)
Social Studies	39	(92.9%)	3	(7.1%)
Behavior	95	(69.3%)	42	(30.7%)
Written Language	116	(77.9%)	33	(22.1%)
Other	49	(81.7%)	11	(18.3%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	464	(75.4%)	151	(24.6%)
Specialized teacher	229	(71.1%)	93	(28.9%)
Paraprofessional	228	(66.3%)	116	(33.7%)
Parent volunteer	43	(68.3%)	20	(31.7%)
Research staff	5	(71.4%)	2	(28.6%)
Other	26	(68.4%)	12	(31.6%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	203	(76.0%)	64	(24.0%)
1 - Exploration	115	(73.7%)	41	(26.3%)
2 - Installation	37	(74.0%)	13	(26.0%)
3 - Initial Implementation	124	(76.1%)	39	(23.9%)
4 - Full Implementation	43	(78.2%)	12	(21.8%)
5 - Innovation	42	(66.7%)	21	(33.3%)
6 - Sustainability	26	(63.4%)	15	(36.6%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	203	(73.0%)	75	(27.0%)
	Other/Off Topic	8	(66.7%)	4	(33.3%)
	Incorrect Definition	187	(77.9%)	53	(22.1%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	94	(70.1%)	40	(29.9%)
	Partial Definition	92	(75.4%)	30	(24.6%)
	Full Definition	29	(74.4%)	10	(25.6%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	185	(74.9%)	62	(25.1%)
	Other/Off Topic	7	(53.8%)	6	(46.2%)
	Incorrect Definition	163	(83.6%)	32	(16.4%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	178	(71.2%)	72	(28.8%)
	Partial Definition	62	(65.3%)	33	(34.7%)
	Full Definition	18	(72.0%)	7	(28.0%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	230	(79.3%)	60	(20.7%)
	None	29	(90.6%)	3	(9.4%)
	Once	24	(64.9%)	13	(35.1%)
	Twice	59	(72.0%)	23	(28.0%)
	Three times	61	(73.5%)	22	(26.5%)
	More than 3 times	194	(70.3%)	82	(29.7%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	267	(79.7%)	68	(20.3%)
	Never	9	(75.0%)	3	(25.0%)
	Every six weeks or less often	47	(90.4%)	5	(9.6%)
	Every four to five weeks	72	(77.4%)	21	(22.6%)
	Every two to three weeks	131	(61.8%)	81	(38.2%)
	Weekly or more often	74	(72.5%)	28	(27.5%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	326	(81.1%)	76	(18.9%)
	Never	12	(85.7%)	2	(14.3%)
	Every six weeks or less often	16	(80.0%)	4	(20.0%)
	Every four to five weeks	37	(84.1%)	7	(15.9%)
	Every two to three weeks	103	(58.5%)	73	(41.5%)
	Weekly or more often	98	(71.0%)	40	(29.0%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	227	(75.7%)	73	(24.3%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	48	(76.2%)	15	(23.8%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	133	(76.0%)	42	(24.0%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	163	(71.5%)	65	(28.5%)
	When six data points have been collected	7	(50.0%)	7	(50.0%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	13	(92.9%)	1	(7.1%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	238	(79.9%)	60	(20.1%)
	Never	7	(100%)	0	(.0%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	147	(74.2%)	51	(25.8%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	59	(68.6%)	27	(31.4%)
	Once per month or less frequently	69	(67.6%)	33	(32.4%)
	More often than once per month	75	(69.4%)	33	(30.6%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	357	(76.0%)	113	(24.0%)
	One or two	151	(74.0%)	53	(26.0%)
	Three or four	43	(62.3%)	26	(37.7%)
	Five or more	29	(76.3%)	9	(23.7%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	33	(86.8%)	5	(13.2%)
	Disagree	79	(80.6%)	19	(19.4%)
	Agree	242	(73.8%)	86	(26.2%)
	Strongly Agree	140	(70.7%)	58	(29.3%)
	Don't Know	103	(72.0%)	40	(28.0%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	23	(74.2%)	8	(25.8%)
	Disagree	38	(80.9%)	9	(19.1%)
	Agree	245	(76.6%)	75	(23.4%)
	Strongly Agree	255	(69.9%)	110	(30.1%)
	Don't Know	18	(85.7%)	3	(14.3%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	32	(82.1%)	7	(17.9%)
	Disagree	83	(79.0%)	22	(21.0%)
	Agree	282	(75.0%)	94	(25.0%)
	Strongly Agree	157	(69.5%)	69	(30.5%)
	Don't Know	36	(72.0%)	14	(28.0%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	17	(81.0%)	4	(19.0%)
	Disagree	81	(69.8%)	35	(30.2%)
	Agree	332	(74.8%)	112	(25.2%)
	Strongly Agree	113	(74.3%)	39	(25.7%)
	Don't Know	50	(72.5%)	19	(27.5%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	28	(77.8%)	8	(22.2%)
	Disagree	119	(75.3%)	39	(24.7%)
	Agree	254	(74.1%)	89	(25.9%)
	Strongly Agree	102	(70.3%)	43	(29.7%)
	Don't Know	79	(74.5%)	27	(25.5%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	31	(79.5%)	8	(20.5%)
	Disagree	98	(77.8%)	28	(22.2%)
	Agree	226	(74.3%)	78	(25.7%)
	Strongly Agree	123	(67.6%)	59	(32.4%)
	Don't Know	113	(75.8%)	36	(24.2%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	37	(75.5%)	12	(24.5%)
	Disagree	79	(72.5%)	30	(27.5%)
	Agree	280	(77.3%)	82	(22.7%)
	Strongly Agree	171	(71.3%)	69	(28.8%)
	Don't Know	14	(51.9%)	13	(48.1%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	22	(71.0%)	9	(29.0%)
	Disagree	35	(62.5%)	21	(37.5%)
	Agree	244	(76.0%)	77	(24.0%)
	Strongly Agree	236	(73.5%)	85	(26.5%)
	Don't Know	39	(72.2%)	15	(27.8%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	47	(85.5%)	8	(14.5%)
	Disagree	69	(79.3%)	18	(20.7%)
	Agree	231	(79.7%)	59	(20.3%)
	Strongly Agree	178	(65.7%)	93	(34.3%)
	Don't Know	62	(68.9%)	28	(31.1%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	18	(64.3%)	10	(35.7%)
	Disagree	58	(77.3%)	17	(22.7%)
	Agree	293	(77.9%)	83	(22.1%)
	Strongly Agree	160	(66.9%)	79	(33.1%)
	Don't Know	49	(74.2%)	17	(25.8%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	28	(77.8%)	8	(22.2%)
	Disagree	116	(81.7%)	26	(18.3%)
	Agree	264	(74.8%)	89	(25.2%)
	Strongly Agree	120	(64.2%)	67	(35.8%)
	Don't Know	63	(82.9%)	13	(17.1%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	18	(81.8%)	4	(18.2%)
	Disagree	129	(71.7%)	51	(28.3%)
	Agree	291	(74.0%)	102	(26.0%)
	Strongly Agree	81	(72.3%)	31	(27.7%)
	Don't Know	60	(75.9%)	19	(24.1%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	23	(88.5%)	3	(11.5%)
	Disagree	49	(76.6%)	15	(23.4%)
	Agree	280	(76.9%)	84	(23.1%)
	Strongly Agree	181	(66.5%)	91	(33.5%)
	Don't Know	60	(78.9%)	16	(21.1%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	28	(84.8%)	5	(15.2%)
	Disagree	118	(81.9%)	26	(18.1%)
	Agree	233	(73.0%)	86	(27.0%)
	Strongly Agree	106	(63.5%)	61	(36.5%)
	Don't Know	95	(76.6%)	29	(23.4%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	19	(76.0%)	6	(24.0%)
	Disagree	86	(81.1%)	20	(18.9%)
	Agree	259	(74.4%)	89	(25.6%)
	Strongly Agree	119	(66.1%)	61	(33.9%)
	Don't Know	109	(77.9%)	31	(22.1%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	26	(74.3%)	9	(25.7%)
	Disagree	77	(81.9%)	17	(18.1%)
	Agree	246	(73.2%)	90	(26.8%)
	Strongly Agree	138	(69.0%)	62	(31.0%)
	Don't Know	95	(77.9%)	27	(22.1%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	19	(73.1%)	7	(26.9%)
	Disagree	31	(73.8%)	11	(26.2%)
	Agree	314	(76.6%)	96	(23.4%)
	Strongly Agree	182	(69.2%)	81	(30.8%)
	Don't Know	46	(79.3%)	12	(20.7%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	16	(84.2%)	3	(15.8%)
	Disagree	23	(76.7%)	7	(23.3%)
	Agree	293	(76.9%)	88	(23.1%)
	Strongly Agree	211	(69.9%)	91	(30.1%)
	Don't Know	34	(68.0%)	16	(32.0%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	19	(76.0%)	6	(24.0%)
	Disagree	27	(77.1%)	8	(22.9%)
	Agree	279	(76.0%)	88	(24.0%)
	Strongly Agree	220	(72.1%)	85	(27.9%)
	Don't Know	42	(68.9%)	19	(31.1%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	17	(77.3%)	5	(22.7%)
	Disagree	69	(75.8%)	22	(24.2%)
	Agree	172	(75.1%)	57	(24.9%)
	Strongly Agree	62	(67.4%)	30	(32.6%)
	Don't Know	250	(73.5%)	90	(26.5%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	14	(63.6%)	8	(36.4%)
	Disagree	100	(76.9%)	30	(23.1%)
	Agree	168	(73.0%)	62	(27.0%)
	Strongly Agree	46	(66.7%)	23	(33.3%)
	Don't Know	256	(75.7%)	82	(24.3%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	8	(66.7%)	4	(33.3%)
	Disagree	57	(75.0%)	19	(25.0%)
	Agree	207	(74.2%)	72	(25.8%)
	Strongly Agree	60	(64.5%)	33	(35.5%)
	Don't Know	241	(76.3%)	75	(23.7%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	17	(77.3%)	5	(22.7%)
	Disagree	69	(82.1%)	15	(17.9%)
	Agree	183	(72.6%)	69	(27.4%)
	Strongly Agree	66	(66.0%)	34	(34.0%)
	Don't Know	249	(75.5%)	81	(24.5%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	13	(81.3%)	3	(18.8%)
	Disagree	89	(80.9%)	21	(19.1%)
	Agree	156	(72.6%)	59	(27.4%)
	Strongly Agree	55	(61.8%)	34	(38.2%)
	Don't Know	259	(75.7%)	83	(24.3%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	13	(76.5%)	4	(23.5%)
	Disagree	61	(78.2%)	17	(21.8%)
	Agree	149	(75.3%)	49	(24.7%)
	Strongly Agree	36	(62.1%)	22	(37.9%)
	Don't Know	325	(74.4%)	112	(25.6%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	22	(81.5%)	5	(18.5%)
	Disagree	75	(78.9%)	20	(21.1%)
	Agree	275	(74.9%)	92	(25.1%)
	Strongly Agree	99	(68.8%)	45	(31.3%)
	Don't Know	100	(70.4%)	42	(29.6%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	27	(87.1%)	4	(12.9%)
	Disagree	67	(74.4%)	23	(25.6%)
	Agree	268	(73.6%)	96	(26.4%)
	Strongly Agree	129	(73.3%)	47	(26.7%)
	Don't Know	93	(72.7%)	35	(27.3%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	40	(83.3%)	8	(16.7%)
	Disagree	108	(83.1%)	22	(16.9%)
	Agree	153	(71.2%)	62	(28.8%)
	Strongly Agree	47	(63.5%)	27	(36.5%)
	Don't Know	222	(73.3%)	81	(26.7%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	52	(89.7%)	6	(10.3%)
	Disagree	97	(78.9%)	26	(21.1%)
	Agree	158	(70.9%)	65	(29.1%)
	Strongly Agree	58	(68.2%)	27	(31.8%)
	Don't Know	218	(72.9%)	81	(27.1%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	40	(88.9%)	5	(11.1%)
	Disagree	83	(85.6%)	14	(14.4%)
	Agree	123	(67.2%)	60	(32.8%)
	Strongly Agree	51	(66.2%)	26	(33.8%)
	Don't Know	269	(73.3%)	98	(26.7%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	23	(82.1%)	5	(17.9%)
	Disagree	12	(75.0%)	4	(25.0%)
	Agree	240	(72.9%)	89	(27.1%)
	Strongly Agree	294	(74.8%)	99	(25.2%)
	Don't Know	19	(65.5%)	10	(34.5%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	31	(77.5%)	9	(22.5%)
	Disagree	89	(78.8%)	24	(21.2%)
	Agree	230	(71.2%)	93	(28.8%)
	Strongly Agree	135	(69.6%)	59	(30.4%)
	Don't Know	92	(82.9%)	19	(17.1%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	23	(79.3%)	6	(20.7%)
	Disagree	12	(85.7%)	2	(14.3%)
	Agree	216	(72.5%)	82	(27.5%)
	Strongly Agree	325	(74.7%)	110	(25.3%)
	Don't Know	14	(70.0%)	6	(30.0%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	35	(83.3%)	7	(16.7%)
	Disagree	107	(77.5%)	31	(22.5%)
	Agree	217	(71.6%)	86	(28.4%)
	Strongly Agree	136	(68.7%)	62	(31.3%)
	Don't Know	80	(83.3%)	16	(16.7%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	35	(89.7%)	4	(10.3%)
	Disagree	70	(76.1%)	22	(23.9%)
	Agree	163	(70.9%)	67	(29.1%)
	Strongly Agree	60	(69.0%)	27	(31.0%)
	Don't Know	261	(75.4%)	85	(24.6%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	25	(86.2%)	4	(13.8%)
	Disagree	60	(75.9%)	19	(24.1%)
	Agree	185	(70.3%)	78	(29.7%)
	Strongly Agree	92	(71.9%)	36	(28.1%)
	Don't Know	214	(76.7%)	65	(23.3%)

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	24	(82.8%)	5	(17.2%)
	Disagree	43	(76.8%)	13	(23.2%)
	Agree	166	(72.8%)	62	(27.2%)
	Strongly Agree	78	(72.2%)	30	(27.8%)
	Don't Know	277	(74.9%)	93	(25.1%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	19	(79.2%)	5	(20.8%)
	Disagree	45	(77.6%)	13	(22.4%)
	Agree	127	(70.9%)	52	(29.1%)
	Strongly Agree	53	(70.7%)	22	(29.3%)
	Don't Know	332	(75.1%)	110	(24.9%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	24	(92.3%)	2	(7.7%)
	Disagree	37	(74.0%)	13	(26.0%)
	Agree	57	(70.4%)	24	(29.6%)
	Strongly Agree	37	(75.5%)	12	(24.5%)
	Don't Know	431	(74.1%)	151	(25.9%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	17	(85.0%)	3	(15.0%)
	Disagree	27	(71.1%)	11	(28.9%)
	Agree	63	(69.2%)	28	(30.8%)
	Strongly Agree	29	(78.4%)	8	(21.6%)
	Don't Know	433	(74.1%)	151	(25.9%)

## Vancouver by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	184	(71.9%)	72	(28.1%)
	No Change	339	(77.2%)	100	(22.8%)
	Less Confident	4	(66.7%)	2	(33.3%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	198	(70.0%)	85	(30.0%)
	No Change	322	(78.3%)	89	(21.7%)
	Less Confident	11	(64.7%)	6	(35.3%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	210	(71.4%)	84	(28.6%)
	No Change	313	(76.9%)	94	(23.1%)
	Lower Expectations	2	(66.7%)	1	(33.3%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	236	(72.0%)	92	(28.0%)
	No Change	285	(77.2%)	84	(22.8%)
	Lower Expectations	3	(50.0%)	3	(50.0%)

## Walla Walla – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 273	16	(5.9%)	257	(94.1%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	17.27	11.3	(38)	15.64	9.0	(40)
Years at current school	5.00	3.7	(12)	9.20	6.9	(38)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	7.00	4.6	(14)	9.52	8.1	(37)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
Associate’s Degree	1	(8.3%)	11	(91.7%)
Bachelor’s Degree	4	(8.0%)	46	(92.0%)
Master’s Degree	9	(5.3%)	162	(94.7%)
Doctorate	1	(50.0%)	1	(50.0%)
Other	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	12	(5.9%)	190	(94.1%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	5	(16.1%)	26	(83.9%)
Other Certification – Yes	6	(5.2%)	109	(94.8%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	6	(3.8%)	153	(96.2%)
Mathematics	7	(4.8%)	140	(95.2%)
Science	5	(6.0%)	79	(94.0%)
Social Studies	3	(3.4%)	84	(96.6%)
Behavior	2	(2.4%)	83	(97.6%)
Written Language	7	(5.1%)	130	(94.9%)
Other	3	(4.1%)	70	(95.9%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	7	(3.7%)	182	(96.3%)
Tier II	8	(5.2%)	146	(94.8%)
Tier III	6	(8.1%)	68	(91.9%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	46	(100%)
Other Tier	1	(7.7%)	12	(92.3%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	5	(7.5%)	62	(92.5%)
Reading	5	(3.8%)	125	(96.2%)
Mathematics	3	(2.9%)	100	(97.1%)
Science	3	(15.8%)	16	(84.2%)
Social Studies	2	(12.5%)	14	(87.5%)
Behavior	3	(10.3%)	26	(89.7%)
Written Language	6	(9.4%)	58	(90.6%)
Other	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	13	(6.4%)	191	(93.6%)
Specialized teacher	3	(2.7%)	107	(97.3%)
Paraprofessional	3	(2.2%)	135	(97.8%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
Research staff	1	(11.1%)	8	(88.9%)
Other	1	(5.0%)	19	(95.0%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	7	(11.5%)	54	(88.5%)
1 - Exploration	1	(1.9%)	51	(98.1%)
2 - Installation	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
3 - Initial Implementation	1	(2.4%)	41	(97.6%)
4 - Full Implementation	1	(3.6%)	27	(96.4%)
5 - Innovation	1	(3.0%)	32	(97.0%)
6 - Sustainability	2	(9.1%)	20	(90.9%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	10	(11.4%)	78	(88.6%)
	Other/Off Topic	1	(100%)	0	(.0%)
	Incorrect Definition	1	(1.5%)	66	(98.5%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	2	(5.4%)	35	(94.6%)
	Partial Definition	2	(3.6%)	54	(96.4%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	7	(9.3%)	68	(90.7%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	4	(6.7%)	56	(93.3%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	4	(6.3%)	59	(93.7%)
	Partial Definition	1	(1.7%)	57	(98.3%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	5	(5.6%)	85	(94.4%)
	None	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)
	Once	2	(10.5%)	17	(89.5%)
	Twice	2	(4.3%)	44	(95.7%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	More than 3 times	5	(7.1%)	65	(92.9%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	8	(7.5%)	98	(92.5%)
	Never	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	1	(1.8%)	56	(98.2%)
	Weekly or more often	5	(11.6%)	38	(88.4%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	8	(4.8%)	158	(95.2%)
	Never	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	2	(4.9%)	39	(95.1%)
	Weekly or more often	4	(14.8%)	23	(85.2%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	7	(6.8%)	96	(93.2%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	2	(7.4%)	25	(92.6%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	2	(3.8%)	51	(96.2%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	3	(4.4%)	65	(95.6%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	8	(7.8%)	94	(92.2%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	2	(3.1%)	63	(96.9%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	2	(4.9%)	39	(95.1%)
	Once per month or less frequently	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
	More often than once per month	2	(8.3%)	22	(91.7%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	8	(6.8%)	109	(93.2%)
	One or two	7	(7.3%)	89	(92.7%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	3	(50.0%)	3	(50.0%)
	Disagree	2	(7.7%)	24	(92.3%)
	Agree	8	(6.9%)	108	(93.1%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.6%)	61	(98.4%)
	Don't Know	2	(3.4%)	56	(96.6%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	2	(50.0%)	2	(50.0%)
	Disagree	2	(9.1%)	20	(90.9%)
	Agree	8	(6.7%)	112	(93.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(.9%)	108	(99.1%)
	Don't Know	3	(23.1%)	10	(76.9%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	2	(28.6%)	5	(71.4%)
	Disagree	4	(12.9%)	27	(87.1%)
	Agree	7	(5.2%)	128	(94.8%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.8%)	69	(97.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(4.8%)	20	(95.2%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	1	(50.0%)	1	(50.0%)
	Disagree	5	(14.3%)	30	(85.7%)
	Agree	7	(4.6%)	145	(95.4%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.1%)	47	(97.9%)
	Don't Know	2	(6.7%)	28	(93.3%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	2	(22.2%)	7	(77.8%)
	Disagree	5	(9.6%)	47	(90.4%)
	Agree	7	(6.3%)	104	(93.7%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	48	(100%)
	Don't Know	2	(4.2%)	46	(95.8%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	2	(28.6%)	5	(71.4%)
	Disagree	5	(10.6%)	42	(89.4%)
	Agree	5	(4.6%)	104	(95.4%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	50	(100%)
	Don't Know	4	(7.5%)	49	(92.5%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	2	(10.0%)	18	(90.0%)
	Disagree	7	(12.7%)	48	(87.3%)
	Agree	5	(4.0%)	119	(96.0%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.8%)	55	(98.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(9.1%)	10	(90.9%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(11.1%)	16	(88.9%)
	Agree	10	(8.4%)	109	(91.6%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(2.7%)	109	(97.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.9%)	16	(94.1%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Disagree	1	(1.8%)	54	(98.2%)
	Agree	11	(12.1%)	80	(87.9%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.7%)	73	(97.3%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.2%)	30	(96.8%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(6.1%)	31	(93.9%)
	Agree	12	(9.1%)	120	(90.9%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.4%)	73	(98.6%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	2	(20.0%)	8	(80.0%)
	Disagree	5	(11.4%)	39	(88.6%)
	Agree	6	(4.7%)	122	(95.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.7%)	58	(98.3%)
	Don't Know	2	(7.4%)	25	(92.6%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	4	(7.8%)	47	(92.2%)
	Agree	9	(6.4%)	131	(93.6%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(4.8%)	40	(95.2%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	2	(40.0%)	3	(60.0%)
	Disagree	5	(26.3%)	14	(73.7%)
	Agree	6	(4.7%)	122	(95.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.1%)	86	(98.9%)
	Don't Know	2	(7.1%)	26	(92.9%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	2	(25.0%)	6	(75.0%)
	Disagree	5	(9.8%)	46	(90.2%)
	Agree	7	(7.2%)	90	(92.8%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.0%)	49	(98.0%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.7%)	59	(98.3%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	3	(37.5%)	5	(62.5%)
	Disagree	2	(7.1%)	26	(92.9%)
	Agree	6	(5.0%)	114	(95.0%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.9%)	51	(98.1%)
	Don't Know	4	(7.0%)	53	(93.0%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	2	(40.0%)	3	(60.0%)
	Disagree	1	(4.3%)	22	(95.7%)
	Agree	7	(5.7%)	115	(94.3%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(1.7%)	59	(98.3%)
	Don't Know	5	(8.9%)	51	(91.1%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(5.9%)	16	(94.1%)
	Agree	7	(4.9%)	135	(95.1%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(2.6%)	76	(97.4%)
	Don't Know	6	(23.1%)	20	(76.9%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Agree	10	(7.2%)	129	(92.8%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(4.3%)	89	(95.7%)
	Don't Know	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	11	(8.5%)	118	(91.5%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(4.2%)	92	(95.8%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(4.9%)	39	(95.1%)
	Agree	6	(5.7%)	99	(94.3%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)
	Don't Know	8	(9.4%)	77	(90.6%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(2.4%)	41	(97.6%)
	Agree	7	(6.9%)	95	(93.1%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Don't Know	6	(7.0%)	80	(93.0%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.2%)	30	(96.8%)
	Agree	7	(6.0%)	110	(94.0%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.7%)	36	(97.3%)
	Don't Know	5	(6.6%)	71	(93.4%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Agree	8	(6.6%)	114	(93.4%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(4.7%)	41	(95.3%)
	Don't Know	4	(6.0%)	63	(94.0%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Agree	8	(8.3%)	88	(91.7%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.9%)	33	(97.1%)
	Don't Know	5	(6.3%)	75	(93.8%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Agree	7	(6.9%)	94	(93.1%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(4.0%)	24	(96.0%)
	Don't Know	6	(5.0%)	113	(95.0%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
	Disagree	2	(6.1%)	31	(93.9%)
	Agree	9	(6.3%)	135	(93.8%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.3%)	42	(97.7%)
	Don't Know	1	(2.4%)	41	(97.6%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	1	(16.7%)	5	(83.3%)
	Disagree	3	(9.7%)	28	(90.3%)
	Agree	6	(3.9%)	147	(96.1%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(4.7%)	41	(95.3%)
	Don't Know	2	(7.4%)	25	(92.6%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	3	(6.0%)	47	(94.0%)
	Agree	5	(5.0%)	95	(95.0%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(3.8%)	25	(96.2%)
	Don't Know	5	(6.3%)	75	(93.8%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	3	(5.4%)	53	(94.6%)
	Agree	4	(4.2%)	91	(95.8%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(3.6%)	27	(96.4%)
	Don't Know	6	(7.9%)	70	(92.1%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.3%)	29	(96.7%)
	Agree	4	(4.1%)	94	(95.9%)
	Strongly Agree	2	(6.9%)	27	(93.1%)
	Don't Know	7	(6.8%)	96	(93.2%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	7	(5.7%)	115	(94.3%)
	Strongly Agree	6	(4.8%)	120	(95.2%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	3	(7.9%)	35	(92.1%)
	Agree	3	(2.7%)	110	(97.3%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(4.1%)	70	(95.9%)
	Don't Know	4	(12.5%)	28	(87.5%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Agree	6	(5.2%)	110	(94.8%)
	Strongly Agree	7	(5.3%)	126	(94.7%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	2	(5.6%)	34	(94.4%)
	Agree	3	(2.6%)	114	(97.4%)
	Strongly Agree	4	(6.0%)	63	(94.0%)
	Don't Know	4	(12.5%)	28	(87.5%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.7%)	26	(96.3%)
	Agree	4	(3.7%)	105	(96.3%)
	Strongly Agree	3	(7.7%)	36	(92.3%)
	Don't Know	5	(5.9%)	80	(94.1%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	1	(16.7%)	5	(83.3%)
	Disagree	2	(6.5%)	29	(93.5%)
	Agree	6	(4.8%)	118	(95.2%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.7%)	36	(97.3%)
	Don't Know	3	(4.5%)	63	(95.5%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	1	(33.3%)	2	(66.7%)
	Disagree	1	(3.3%)	29	(96.7%)
	Agree	5	(4.8%)	99	(95.2%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(2.9%)	33	(97.1%)
	Don't Know	5	(5.4%)	88	(94.6%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	4	(4.9%)	78	(95.1%)
	Strongly Agree	1	(4.2%)	23	(95.8%)
	Don't Know	8	(5.7%)	133	(94.3%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(9.1%)	10	(90.9%)
	Agree	2	(4.4%)	43	(95.6%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
	Don't Know	10	(5.4%)	176	(94.6%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Agree	2	(4.8%)	40	(95.2%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	11	(5.7%)	181	(94.3%)

## Walla Walla by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	8	(7.4%)	100	(92.6%)
	No Change	6	(4.4%)	129	(95.6%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	7	(4.9%)	135	(95.1%)
	No Change	7	(7.3%)	89	(92.7%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	9	(7.6%)	109	(92.4%)
	No Change	5	(3.9%)	123	(96.1%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	5	(3.5%)	136	(96.5%)
	No Change	8	(8.3%)	88	(91.7%)
	Lower Expectations	1	(25.0%)	3	(75.0%)

## White River – Spring 2010 Survey Results by Implementing

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 by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents

Survey Participants	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Number of Respondents = 158	1	(.6%)	157	(99.4%)

Experience	Not Implementing			Implementing		
	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Years as an educator	13.00	.	(0)	16.31	7.9	(34)
Years at current school	13.00	.	(0)	7.86	6.5	(26)
Years in current class (grade level, content area, level of instruction)	3.00	.	(0)	8.32	7.0	(32)

## White River by Implementing – Description of Survey Respondents, continued

Highest Degree	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
High School	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
Associate's Degree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
Bachelor's Degree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
Master's Degree	1	(1.0%)	97	(99.0%)
Doctorate	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
Other	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)

Qualifications	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Highly Qualified (Teachers Only) – Yes	1	(.8%)	121	(99.2%)
SPED Endorsement – Yes	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Other Certification – Yes	1	(1.6%)	62	(98.4%)

Content Area Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Reading	1	(1.0%)	98	(99.0%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	85	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	47	(100%)
Written Language	1	(1.3%)	78	(98.7%)
Other	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)

Level of Instruction Taught	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Tier I	0	(.0%)	110	(100%)
Tier II	0	(.0%)	98	(100%)
Tier III	0	(.0%)	64	(100%)
Accelerated	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
Other Tier	1	(20.0%)	4	(80.0%)

## White River by Implementing – RTI Questions

Content Area Implemented	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
None/I don't know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
Reading	1	(1.1%)	94	(98.9%)
Mathematics	0	(.0%)	52	(100%)
Science	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
Social Studies	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
Behavior	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
Written Language	1	(2.4%)	41	(97.6%)
Other	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)

## White River by Implementing – RTI Questions

Intervention Provider	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
Classroom teacher	0	(.0%)	121	(100%)
Specialized teacher	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
Paraprofessional	0	(.0%)	70	(100%)
Parent volunteer	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Research staff	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
Other	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)

Level of RTI Implementation	Not Implementing		Implementing	
	N	%	N	%
0 - None/I Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
1 - Exploration	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
2 - Installation	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
3 - Initial Implementation	1	(2.9%)	34	(97.1%)
4 - Full Implementation	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
5 - Innovation	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
6 - Sustainability	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)

## White River by Implementing – Assessment Knowledge

Assessment Knowledge		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Screening Measure Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Incorrect Definition	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	1	(5.9%)	16	(94.1%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	38	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
Progress Monitoring Definitions	No Response	0	(.0%)	43	(100%)
	Other/Off Topic	0	(.0%)	0	(.0%)
	Incorrect Definition	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
	Broad/Vague Definition	0	(.0%)	53	(100%)
	Partial Definition	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Full Definition	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)

## White River by Implementing – Assessment Frequency

Assessment Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How often were screening measures administered in the past year?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	0	(.0%)	27	(100%)
	None	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Once	1	(8.3%)	11	(91.7%)
	Twice	0	(.0%)	30	(100%)
	Three times	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	More than 3 times	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier II?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	1	(2.0%)	49	(98.0%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
How often are progress-monitoring measures administered in Tier III?	Don't Know/Doesn't Apply	1	(1.5%)	67	(98.5%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Every six weeks or less often	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Every four to five weeks	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Every two to three weeks	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Weekly or more often	0	(.0%)	45	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to make instructional decisions (e.g., to change an intervention within the same tier of instruction)?	I don't know	1	(2.2%)	45	(97.8%)
	Never, teachers recommend changes when they feel they are necessary	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	When one or two data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	When three to five data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	54	(100%)
	When six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	When more than six data points have been collected	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
How often is student data reviewed to determine if students need to be provided with a different tier of instruction?	Never/I don't know	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Never	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Three times per academic year or less frequently	1	(4.8%)	20	(95.2%)
	Once every six weeks or less frequently	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
	Once per month or less frequently	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	More often than once per month	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)

## White River by Implementing – Professional Development Frequency

Professional Development Frequency		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In the past year, how many professional development sessions have been offered (and/or provided) to you that helped you implement an RTI framework of instruction?	None	1	(1.4%)	70	(98.6%)
	One or two	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
	Three or four	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Five or more	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)

## White River by Implementing – Implementation Coherence

Implementation Coherence		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
This school is often one of the first to adopt a new program, practice, or educational model.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(5.6%)	17	(94.4%)
This school has explicit goals for what we want students to achieve (learning outcomes) at each grade level.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.5%)	65	(98.5%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	75	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Programs for improving student performance are coordinated at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.2%)	23	(95.8%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
Goals and objectives for students' learning outcomes are being met at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	94	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
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).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.6%)	27	(96.4%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	78	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
At this school, we know what the fidelity criteria are (i.e., what is being looked for or at) when instruction is observed.	Strongly Disagree	1	(8.3%)	11	(91.7%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	80	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
The administrators at this school spend time in class observing instruction.	Strongly Disagree	1	(6.7%)	14	(93.3%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	44	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Everyone who delivers instruction (core, intervention and supplemental) to students in my classroom is knowledgeable.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(8.3%)	11	(91.7%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	74	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	60	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
All students receive core instruction in the general education classroom.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.4%)	68	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	36	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	16	(100%)
Core instruction is designed to engage all students (e.g., differentiated or adapted to meet each student's needs).	Strongly Disagree	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	39	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
There is a systematic, formal, problem-solving process for intervening with struggling students at this school.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	35	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
Educators at this school are meeting the needs of struggling students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	96	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
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.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	74	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	50	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
This school has a set of clear, predetermined entry and exit criteria for all levels of instruction/intervention (core and interventions).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.6%)	27	(96.4%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	73	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
At this school, we use data from each screening to ensure that core instruction is meeting the needs of most of our students.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	80	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	18	(100%)
At this school, administrators use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	70	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
At this school, teachers use assessment information to help make decisions about instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.1%)	91	(98.9%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	51	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
I am able to interpret assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.2%)	81	(98.8%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	61	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
I am able to make instructional decisions based upon assessment data.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.2%)	84	(98.8%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	59	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made in a timely manner.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	79	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	25	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made efficiently (i.e., students do not have to wait to receive appropriate instruction).	Strongly Disagree	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	69	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	22	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, instructional decisions are made reliably (i.e., students receive instruction appropriate to their level of need).	Strongly Disagree	1	(12.5%)	7	(87.5%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	88	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, at-risk students are identified early.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.3%)	22	(95.7%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	69	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	33	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, all at-risk students are identified.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.1%)	31	(96.9%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	67	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	29	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, fewer students who are not at risk have been identified as being at risk.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	4	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	58	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.7%)	59	(98.3%)
Leaders in this school provide educators with resources they need to meet student achievement goals.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	5	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	84	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
Leaders at this school provide direction in matters of curriculum, teaching, and learning.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.1%)	86	(98.9%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	37	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
At this school, professional development related to RTI is coordinated.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(4.5%)	21	(95.5%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	84	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	20	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
Educators at this school are prepared to implement RTI.	Strongly Disagree	1	(10.0%)	9	(90.0%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	17	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	23	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
Leaders in my school have been offered adequate opportunities to increase their ability to assist with RTI implementation.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(6.3%)	15	(93.8%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	73	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	24	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
In general, I think I am capable of managing my instruction (e.g., differentiating instruction, pacing, etc).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.4%)	70	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	78	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with managing my instruction.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(5.3%)	18	(94.7%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	79	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	32	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
In general, I think I am capable of managing my students (e.g., behavior).	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.4%)	73	(98.6%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	76	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
There is a system (e.g., an 'intervention team?') in place for me to access help with classroom management.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	21	(100%)
	Agree	1	(1.3%)	76	(98.7%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	31	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	12	(100%)
Educators at this school have an influence on RTI-related school policies and activities.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	19	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	72	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(4.0%)	24	(96.0%)
Educators at this school work together to solve RTI-related challenges.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	10	(100%)
	Disagree	1	(7.1%)	13	(92.9%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	83	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	34	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)

Implementation Coherence, continued		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
Since implementing RTI, our school has a more-widely shared common vision.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	8	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	15	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	62	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	40	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(3.4%)	28	(96.6%)
Since implementing RTI, the number of referrals to Special Education has decreased.	Strongly Disagree	1	(11.1%)	8	(88.9%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	13	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	55	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Don't Know	0	(.0%)	49	(100%)
Since implementing RTI, our students' learning outcomes have improved in all areas in which RTI was implemented.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	9	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	7	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	28	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.0%)	96	(99.0%)
Since implementing RTI, there have been fewer referrals to Special Education that did not result in identification.	Strongly Disagree	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
	Disagree	0	(.0%)	3	(100%)
	Agree	0	(.0%)	26	(100%)
	Strongly Agree	0	(.0%)	14	(100%)
	Don't Know	1	(1.0%)	103	(99.0%)

## White River by Implementing – Efficacy and Expectancy

Efficacy and Expectancy		Not Implementing		Implementing	
		N	%	N	%
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your ability</u> to meet the needs of all of your students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	68	(100%)
	No Change	1	(1.2%)	81	(98.8%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	2	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>confidence in your school's ability</u> to meet the needs of all students?	More Confident	0	(.0%)	88	(100%)
	No Change	1	(1.7%)	57	(98.3%)
	Less Confident	0	(.0%)	6	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed your <u>expectations</u> for your students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	67	(100%)
	No Change	1	(1.2%)	83	(98.8%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	1	(100%)
How do you think implementing RTI has changed <u>expectations at your school</u> for students' academic (or behavioral) performance?	Higher Expectations	0	(.0%)	89	(100%)
	No Change	1	(2.0%)	49	(98.0%)
	Lower Expectations	0	(.0%)	11	(100%)