1-1-2008

Teacher Skill and Response to Intervention in West Virginia Pilot Schools

Janna Christy
christy@marshall.edu

Teacher Skill and
Response to Intervention in
West Virginia Pilot Schools

Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College
of Marshall University

By

Janna Christy

Fred Jay Krieg, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson
Sandra S. Stroebel, Ph.D.
Edna Meisel, Ed.D.

Marshall University

July 2008

Abstract

As a program evaluation, the West Virginia Department of Education implemented a

Response to Intervention (RtI) approach to the identification of students with learning

disabilities in the spring of 2005. Eleven pilot schools were used in the West Virginia RtI

program evaluation. The purpose of this study was to assess the change that resulted in

teacher skills as a consequence of the implementation of the RtI model. It was hypothesized

that teachers' skills will significantly change in a positive direction as result of the

implementation. A pre-post survey design was utilized to evaluate the outcome.

Significant positive changes were reported in skills and knowledge relevant to reading

instruction and teaching the five essential components of reading while no significant

change was reported in skills involving using RtI to differentiate instruction, using

assessment to guide instruction and designing specific interventions.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to express gratitude to the members of the Response to Intervention external evaluation team that assisted in gathering all of the pertinent information for this study. I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Meisel for the assistance with the data and guidance with the overall thesis process. To Dr. Stroebel, I would like to express gratitude for assurance and help with programmatic details. Last, I would like to extend my deep appreciation to Dr. Krieg for his guidance throughout this program as a professor and a mentor.

List of Tables

Teacher Skill and Response to Intervention
in West Virginia Pilot Schools

CHAPTER I

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Response to Intervention (RtI) was being considered as a means to identify

students with a learning disability in the state of West Virginia at the onset of this study.

As of September of 2007, WV Policy 2419 Regulations for the Education of Students

with Exceptionalities provided for the gradual introduction of Response to Intervention as

the exclusive method for identifying children with learning disabilities. The inception of

RtI is based upon problems the country faces in correctly operationalizing how a student

is determined to have a learning disability. Prior to the most recent legislation,

Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004, a team of professionals were able

to determine a child had a learning disability if they detected a severe discrepancy

between achievement and intellectual ability in one or more of the following areas: oral

expression, listening comprehension, written expression, basic reading skills, reading

comprehension, mathematics calculation, or mathematical reasoning. According to

Vellutino, Scanlon, & Lyon (2000), "the IQ-achievement discrepancy does not reliably

distinguish between disabled and non-disabled readers or learners…children who were

found to be difficult (and easy) to remediate…and it does not predict response to

remediation". Therefore, a new method for identifying a learning disability was

necessary.

In addition, the number of students identified with a learning disability has

increased more than 200% since the category was introduced in 1977, with some research

pointing to the fact that many students have been misidentified or unidentified (Vaughn,

Linan-Thompson, & Hickman 2003). This problem, along with the need to wait until a discrepancy is prevalent in some children, guided the reauthorization of IDEA in 2004 to allow more freedom in learning disability eligibility determination.

The following conclusions were derived from the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (NJCLD) and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) regarding the concept of learning disabilities, IQ/Achievement discrepancy, and response to intervention: (a) strong evidence supports the concept of a severe learning disability and it strongly affects a student's academic and performance outcomes; (b) IQ/Achievement discrepancy is neither necessary nor sufficient for identifying students with a severe learning disability; and (c) response to quality intervention is the most promising method of alternate identification (Bradley, Danielson, & Doolittle, 2005). As a result of the convergent research, the reauthorization of IDEA 2004 now allows the use of RtI as a means of determining eligibility.

The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDOE) decided to try Response to Intervention and began implementation in several schools in the spring of 2005 as a pilot project. The proposed goals of the initial project in West Virginia include (Olsen, 2005):

1. Increase reading skills in ALL students

2. Strengthen early intervention and prevention of reading difficulties for struggling readers

3. Support and further professional development in reading instruction for all teachers

4. Create a process that provides for the appropriate identification of students with LD

5. Reduce referrals to special education

The West Virginia RtI pilot project includes a three-tiered approach to reading with the necessity of high quality reading instruction in place for all students at the first tier. High quality reading instruction in these schools consisted of the five critical components of reading outlined in the West Virginia reading/language arts curriculum. Screening and monitoring were accomplished using Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) benchmark assessment three times a year. Students who failed to succeed in tier one were moved along to tier two. At this level additional implementation of research-based interventions were given. Also, the second tier involved frequent progress monitoring to determine how the child was responding to the intervention. If the student continued to show no progression after tier one and tier two interventions were implemented, psycho-educational assessments were administered to determine cognitive and social factors that may have impeded the student's reading success. This assessment is part of the tier three process and is the first step in special education consideration. Tier one consisted of ninety minutes of high quality reading instruction that was administered as a class wide approach. Tier two involved an additional thirty minutes of high quality reading instruction while working more intensely with the targeted students in a smaller group setting. Tier three involved an additional thirty minutes of one-on-one intervention with specified students.

Statement of Hypothesis

Ultimate success in the West Virginia RtI pilot project was dependent on many factors but this study in particular looked toward a change in teacher skill as a result of the implementation of the project. Skill development is an important component to the future implementation and success of Response to Intervention because it will facilitate better classroom instruction and will lead to student success. Survey data was collected from the pilot schools that implemented RtI and it was hypothesized that teacher skill would change between the first and second administration of the survey. The null hypothesis is that there would be no change in teacher skill following the implementation of RtI. The dependent variable is change in teacher skill and the independent variable is implementation of RtI.

Significance of the Study

This program evaluation will provide results that will be used to assess the West Virginia pilot project on the implementation of RtI. The findings will be used to make modifications for future RtI sites. It is important to determine how teachers view their skill level and what role teacher skill development plays in the overall success of the implementation of RtI.

Definition of Terms

The following terms important to this study are defined: Response to Intervention (RtI), learning disability, and skill.

The model that was utilized in the West Virginia RtI pilot project was a three-tier model consisting of six components: (1) universal early screening to determine readiness for reading and inform classroom instruction (three times per year using DIBELS), (2)

focus on scientific based reading research for early intervention for struggling readers, (3) high quality research-based instruction in the general education setting, (4) continuous progress monitoring (e.g., every two to three weeks) to determine skill acquisition and intervention effectiveness and to make modifications, (5) problem solving and collaboration, and (6) increased instructional time in reading. Tier one consisted of all students in the general education setting. Students that were not successful at tier one were then moved to tier two, which involved the implementation of other research-based interventions and progress monitoring of the students' responses to intervention. Finally, if students continued to be unsuccessful in tier two, they were then given a battery of psycho-educational tests to determine cognitive and social factors that impeded their learning to read. Progression through the tiers increased the time and intensity of the instruction and decreased the number of students involved. Tier three was the first special education intervention. However, not all schools progressed to the third tier by the completion of the pilot project.

IDEA 2004 addressed the use of a Response to Intervention model in two different ways. RtI data can be used as part of an evaluation for special education to help in the identification and determination of students with a learning disability—an alternative to the ability-achievement discrepancy criterion. In addition, IDEA allows the option of using up to 15% of Part B funds for "early intervening services… for students… who have not been identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment."

In reference to IDEA 2004, §300.8, the federal definition of a child with a specific learning disability is "…a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculation, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Specific learning disabilities do not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage."

Merriam-Webster's (Skill, 2008) online dictionary, defines skill as a learned power of doing something competently. Teacher skill in this study refers to the acquired skill obtained as a result of the RtI implementation. Qualitative data was collected and analyzed to determine change in school staff skill. More specifically, this study refers to teachers' increased knowledge about reading instruction, targeting students in need, understanding and utilizing the three-tiered model, and using assessment to guide interventions. The data resulted from the survey that was developed by the RtI external evaluation team. Changes in staff skill were measured by comparing survey one results to survey two results (pre and post).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

With the constant desire and necessity to improve student performance in our nation's schools, numerous programs have been initiated. While a great deal of these initiatives have focused on students considered at-risk, little change occurred in state or federal policy regarding the identification and evaluation of students with disabilities since the 1970's. Much has been learned since the 1970's regarding education, assessment, and evaluation of student performance in the classroom. Recently, the most significant shift in special education has been the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA, 2004).

Response to Intervention

Response to Intervention (RtI) has recently gathered a great deal of attention as a means to identify a student with a learning disability. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, permitted the RtI model to be utilized by local education agencies as a means to determine eligibility due to problems associated with the traditional ability-achievement discrepancy in diagnosing a learning disability. The National Association of State Directors of Special Education defined RtI as, "The practice of providing high-quality instruction and intervention matched to student need, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about change in instruction or goals and applying child response data to important educational decisions" (Batsche et al., 2005). According to Batsche et al. (2005), the main goal of Response to Intervention is to reduce special education placements for children whose primary challenge is reading.

According to Tilly (2003), RtI is most effectively accomplished through a three-tiered model of increasing intensity of service and frequency of assessment. Reschley (2003) broke down the three-tiered process as follows:

1. Tier 1 is a universal intervention that adheres to a research based core curriculum in general education. The population consists of all students. Benchmark assessment is administered at least three times per year.

2. Tier 2 is a targeted small-group (three to five students) intervention that is delivered as part of general education. The population consists of approximately 20% of the students. Benchmark assessment is still administered and progress monitoring assessment occurs at least monthly.

3. Tier 3 is an intensive individualized intervention based on problem-solving models and could include special education services. Benchmark assessment is still administered and progress monitoring at least once a week.

RtI is a strong foundation of the problem solving delivery system. This delivery system is best defined as a step-by-step approach that determines how to best meet student needs. Delivering scientifically based interventions and frequently monitoring the response the student makes to the intervention provides critical information about how to narrow down what type of instruction works best for the student. Therefore, special education placement is a function of student failure to respond to interventions as opposed to arbitrary scores derived from standardized testing (Prasse, 2006).

Teacher Skills

In a study developed by the National Council on Teacher Quality (Walsh, Glaser, & Wilcox, 2006), 72 universities across the nation were analyzed by looking at 222 required

courses in reading. It was revealed that only 11 of the 72 institutions were found to teach all of the components of reading. The components included the five building blocks of reading as follows: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. This study went on to note that these results may indicate that teachers may not be receiving critical training on the science of reading.

According to Johnston (2003), assessment to improve instruction requires active learning communities that sustain productive conversations about teaching and learning that are based on data. Successful instruction is a product of screening and assessing children to determine where a learning deficit may be present. Effective schools frequently monitor student progress through a variety of assessment procedures. The assessment results are used to monitor instructional delivery and to improve individual student performance. Also, assessment results should show that an alignment exists between state standards, curriculum, and instructional delivery. Four essential elements of effective use of data to improve instruction include (Lezotte, 1999):

1. Good data
2. Staff expertise with collection and analysis of data
3. Sufficient time structured into the schedule for staff to analyze the information
4. Carefully designed changes in curriculum and instruction that address the needs of identified students by analysis

According to Batsche et al. (2005), decisions in RtI practice are based on professional judgment informed directly by student performance data. This requires an ongoing data collection system be in place and that resulting data is used to make informed instructional decisions. In RtI, three types of assessment are used: (1) screening

applied to all students to identify those not making adequate progress; (2) diagnostics to determine what children can and cannot do in important academic domains; and (3) progress monitoring to determine if academic interventions are producing desired effects.

Implementing a three-tiered model also involves the use of grouping and instructional procedures that allow schools to be responsive to data, differentiate instruction, and intervene early when students are not on track (University of Texas System/Texas Education Agency, 2005). Teachers need to use data to drive instruction and then utilize grouping and re-grouping based on skill deficits. Moving from large group instruction to smaller group or individual instruction gives a student more academically engaged time. The individualized nature of a problem solving approach is based on the belief that success of an intervention cannot be predicted based on student characteristics, and no single intervention will be successful for all students (Fuchs et al. 2003).

Response to Intervention addresses teacher and student accountability in numerous ways. First, a scientifically based reading model must be in place in order to implement the three-tiered approach. This model provides a process for delivering quality reading instruction and reducing the prevalence of reading difficulties in kindergarten through third grade. Also, according to Batsche et al (2005), RtI provides the vehicle to effectively teach all children, intervene early, and use a problem-solving method to make decisions within a multi-tier model. Second, RtI requires the use of assessment to monitor student progress and target children in need through the use of data. This process allows staff to evaluate whether interventions are effective. RtI is an excellent means to guide teachers in the process of assessment. However, the ultimate success of implementing RtI

is dependent upon the basic knowledge of its framework and applying the skills

necessary to provide appropriate instruction and interventions.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Research Design

The research design for this study was a program evaluation. Program evaluation research is used to determine the relative merits of various products and approaches in educational settings (Mertler & Charles, 2005). There are several methods by which a program evaluation can be completed in the field of education. The main methods used for this evaluation were measuring skill changes produced in school staff as a result of RtI implementation. Data for monitoring staff skill change within a program was obtained from teachers and others directly involved in delivering the program. To look at changes produced in school staff it was necessary to compare early-implementation and mid-implementation data. This program evaluation was used to assess Response to Intervention implementation in West Virginia schools.

Participants

The RtI pilot project was implemented for grades K through 3 in 11 schools across the state. To be one of the pilot schools chosen the schools needed to have (Olson, 2005):

1. Reading First or a 3-tier reading model;

2. A committed school level administrator to provide site based leadership;

3. A strong School Assistance Team (SAT) with procedures already in place and an "intervention vs. accommodations" approach for at risk students;

4. Personnel available to collect baseline data, implement tier two intervention, conduct progress monitoring, and document student response to interventions

5. Tier two instructional materials and trained staff;

6. Made a qualified/certified special educator available to implement tier three interventions and document student progress;

7. Made tier three instructional materials available and ensured that staff is adequately trained;

8. Made technology available for collection and management of intervention data; and

9. Participated in the Phonemic Awareness Project

The participants in the West Virginia RtI pilot project included 229 people comprised of teachers, principals, project coordinators, and special education directors who represented the 11 pilot schools participating in the project. The counties in West Virginia represented in the project included: Hampshire, Harrison, Kanawha, Morgan, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh, Tyler, and Wood. The response rates of those who returned the survey from the pre and post implementation surveys were: December-90% (208) and March-84% (194). Because this is a pre-test/post-test analysis, those participants that did not complete both surveys were eliminated. This resulted in a sample of 183 participants whose data was analyzed.

Instruments

The survey that was distributed to all RtI pilot school participants was developed by the RtI external evaluation team in conjunction with the West Virginia State Department of Education (WVDOE), Office of Special Education. The external

evaluation team consisted of five graduate students and two faculty supervisors from the

School Psychology Department at Marshall University's Graduate College in South

Charleston. Survey questions were designed to answer the identified evaluation

questions. The survey (see Appendix 1) consisted of 30 questions, on a 7-point Likert

scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. In addition, six open response

questions were included throughout the survey. The survey had expert validity. In

addition, following the completion of the surveys, the questions were analyzed using

Chronbach's Alpha to determine the reliability of the data. The results of this analysis

(Chronbach's Alpha = .894, p<.05) indicated that the December 2005 and March 2006

surveys were highly reliable when comparing the questions related to teacher skill.

Procedure

The pre-post survey design was utilized. The same survey was used for both

administrations. The surveys were coded by the external evaluation team to ensure

confidentiality of the participants. Each survey was coded using a 6-digit code in the top

right corner. The first digit in the code represented the survey number (1 or 2). The

second and third digits in the code represented the school's assigned number (1-11). The

fourth digit represented the participant's position within the school (Principal=6,

Kindergarten=4, First Grade=1, Second Grade=2, Third Grade=3, Interventionist=7, RtI

Coordinator=5). The fifth and sixth digits in the code represented individual participants.

The surveys were coded and packaged with a cover letter and return envelopes.

They were distributed at the RtI coordinator meetings in December and March by an RtI

project coordinator working in conjunction with the external evaluation team. The RtI

project coordinators then distributed the surveys within their respective school(s).

Following completion of the surveys, participants returned surveys in sealed envelopes to their respective RtI coordinator, who then returned all collected surveys to the external evaluation team.

Survey data was quantitatively analyzed. Quantitative analyses were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the purpose of analyzing teacher skill change following Response to Intervention implementation a matched sample t-test was utilized.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Survey data

The purpose of this study was to determine staff skill change over time following implementation of the West Virginia Response to Intervention pilot project in 11 West Virginia schools. A matched pairs t-test was used to evaluate school staff skill change over time for each question related to skill change.

Question 20: Components of the RtI project (e.g., training, DIBELS, book study) have increased my skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction. $t_{(171)} = 2.645$, $p < .05$.

Question 21: I am more skilled at teaching the five essential components of reading. $t_{(171)} = 2.761$, $p < .05$.

Question 22: The RtI approach has helped me make a difference in teaching the struggling readers in my classroom (e.g., given me skills, knowledge and/or tools). $t_{(166)} = 1.591$, $p > .05$.

Question 25: I understand my role in the implementation of the three-tier reading model. $t_{(176)} = .679$, $p > .05$

Question 26: I know how to assess students using DIBELS. $t_{(174)} = .278$, $p > .05$

Question 27: I can effectively use DIBELS data to inform my instruction (e.g., grouping students, implementing interventions). $t_{(171)} = 1.768$, $p > .05$

Question 28: DIBELS provides important information that allows me to identify specific reading areas in need of intervention. $t_{(173)} = .133$, $p > .05$

Question 29: I know how to design specific reading interventions that are matched to student assessment data. $t_{(172)} = 1.446$, $p > .05$

The comparison of early implementation with mid implementation data for each question related to staff skill indicates that staff skills did not significantly change with regards to implementing the three-tier model, using assessment to guide instruction, and designing specific interventions matched to data. However, there was a significant skill change between early and mid implementation for staff in the areas of knowledge of reading instruction and skills to teach the five essential components of reading.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study examined the effect of the Response to Intervention implementation on teacher skill in a West Virginia program evaluation. It was hypothesized there would be a significant change in teacher skill as a result of the implementation. This effect was examined through a pre-test/post-test analysis of survey data that was administered at the onset of the RtI implementation and at the end of the implementation.

Research points to the fact that data driven instruction is a critical element to the success of a three-tier model. Teachers and staff must be able to devise appropriate instruction and interventions for individual students based on their performance and progress. When looking at the results of this study, the outcome shows that there were significant skill changes regarding the ability to teach the five essential components of reading and teachers reported that the RtI project increased their overall skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction. However, there were no significant changes reported in teacher skill when looking at the ability to use a three-tier model (RtI) to guide classroom instruction or develop appropriate interventions as a result of data.

In conclusion, teachers seemed to have struggled to grasp the concept of using the data for student placement and to differentiate instruction. More professional development may have been beneficial to address this issue.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations of this study include the fact that a change in teacher skill could result from a number of other reasons not being evaluated by this program evaluation.

Delimitations used to narrow this study for researchability include the use of nine schools to represent the evaluation, the use of grades kindergarten through third, and time exposed to RtI. In addition, due to a delay in development and distribution, the surveys were not administered before RtI implementation but soon after. Therefore, the first surveys were sent in December.

References

Batsche, G., E., J., Graden, J.L., Grimes, J., Kovaleski, J. F., Prasse, D., Reschly,
D.J., Schrag, J. & Tilly III, W. D. (2005). *Response to intervention: Policy considerations and implementation*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Bradley, R., Danielson, L., & Doolittle, J. (2005). Response to Intervention. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 38(6), 485-486.

Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P.L., & Young, C. L. (2003). Responsiveness-to-Intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disabilities construct. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practic,. 18*(3), 157-171.

Individuals with Disabilities in Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) of 2004, PL 108-446, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 et. seq.

Johnston, P. (2003). Assessment conversations. *Reading Teacher, 57(*1), 90-92.

Lezotte, L.W. (1999). The effective schools process: A proven path to learning for all. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.

Mertler, C. A., & Charles, C. M. (2005). *Introduction to Educational Research* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Olsen, K. (2005). Evaluating the West Virginia pilot project for Response to Intervention: Plan for the year 1 evaluation. Unpublished manuscript.

Prasse, D. P. (2006). Legal supports for problem-solving systems. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27, 7-15.

Reschly, D.J. (2003). *What if LD identification changed to reflect research findings? Consequences of LD identification changes.* Paper presented at the

Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO. Retrieved July 17, 2008, from http://www.nrcld.org/symposium2003/reschly/reschly.pdf/

Skill. (2008). In Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved July 9, 2008, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/skill.

Tilly, W.D., III. (2003). *How many tiers are needed for successful prevention and early intervention? Heartland Area Education Agency's evolution from four to three tiers.* Paper presented at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities Responsiveness-to-Intervention Symposium, Kansas City, MO. Retrieved July 17, 2008, from http://www.nrcld.org/symposium2003/tilly/tilly.pdf/

University of Texas System/Texas Education Agency. (2005). *Introduction to the 3-Tier Reading Model: Reducing Reading Disabilities for Kindergarten Through Third Grade Students* (4th ed.). Austin, TX: Vaughn Gross Center for Reading and Language Arts.

Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., & Hickman, P. (2003). Response to Instruction as a means of identifying students with reading/learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children,* 69(4), 391-411.

Vellutino, F., Scanlon, D., & Lyon, G. (2000). Differentiating between difficult to remediate and readily remediated poor readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 223-238.

Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D.D. (2006). *What education schools aren't teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning.* National Council on Teacher Quality.

Table 1

Comparison of Survey Question 20 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q20	179	4.80	1.639	2.645	.009*
Post Q20	179	5.11	1.597		

Table 2

Comparison of Survey Question 21 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q21	172	4.63	1.676	2.761	.006*
Post Q21	172	4.98	1.628		

Table 3

Comparison of Survey Question 22 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q22	167	4.74	1.628	1.591	.113
Post Q22	167	4.93	1.610		

Table 4

Comparison of Survey Question 25 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q25	177	5.08	1.561	.679	.498
Post Q25	177	5.18	1.692		

Table 5

Comparison of Survey Question 26 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q26	175	5.77	1.453	.278	.781
Post Q26	175	5.73	1.565		

Table 6

Comparison of Survey Question 27 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q27	172	5.22	1.543	1 .768	.079
Post Q27	172	5.45	1.440		

Table 7

Comparison of Survey Question 28 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q28	174	5.07	1.613	.133	.894
Post Q28	174	5.06	1.654		

Table 8

Comparison of Survey Question 29 Pre and Post Implementation

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-statistic	Significance
Pre Q29	172	4.88	1.538	1.446	.150
Post Q29	172	5.09	1.555		

Appendix 1

December 2005 Survey for the West Virginia RtI Project
RtI Evaluation Team

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND DIRECTIONS:

This survey will take you about 10-15 minutes to complete. The results will be analyzed by the external State RtI Evaluation Team led by Dr. Olsen of the University of Kentucky to help improve the project and to make decisions about the future.

For the purpose of this survey, please keep in mind the following goals of the West Virginia Response to Intervention (RtI) Project:

- To increase reading skills for all students in grades K-3 by implementing universal screening, continuous progress monitoring, and specific, small group interventions for students with reading difficulties; and
- To appropriately identify as learning disabled, only those students who have not mastered grade level reading skills after receiving additional, small group instruction focused on deficit skill areas.

1. Please respond to each question from your personal perspective <u>at this point in time.</u>
2. If you have not yet had a particular experience, please circle "Not Applicable" (NA).
3. Return the form in the sealed envelope provided to your RtI Project coordinator no later than **<u>Wednesday, December 21, 2005.</u>**

<u>A word about confidentiality:</u>
Only summary information will be provided to state and local staff. The number on the form is to ensure confidentiality and will only be used to sort the collected data.

Questions? Ask your coordinator or call Christina at the RtI Evaluation Team Office at 1-800-642-9842, Ext. 62067.

STATE AND LOCAL TRAINING AND SUPPORT

1. The following **state level** training/staff development was helpful for implementing RtI in our school:

	State Training	Strongly Agree			Neutral			Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
A	RtI Overview (August 2005)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
B	Book Study (Fall 2005)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
C	DIBELS Assessment (August 2005)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
D	PDA Use/Technology (August 2005)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

2. The following additional **local** training has been helpful for implementing RtI in our school:

	Local Training	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
A	RtI (General)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
B	Reading (e.g., methods or research	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

C	DIBELS Assessment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA
D	PDA/Technology	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

3. The addition of professional staff (e.g., special education teacher, speech therapist, Title 1 teacher) to assist with reading instruction during the 90 minute uninterrupted block is an effective use of resources.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

4. The PDA/Technology is helpful for managing instruction, e.g., charting student progress.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

5. State RtI resource materials (e.g., book study materials, palm pilots, DIBELS resources) provide useful guidance.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

6. My RtI project coordinator provides the support I need.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. RtI does not take too much time for the benefits we receive

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

EFFECTS ON THE SYSTEM

8. Paperwork has been reduced with RtI.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. As a result of the RtI project, our faculty is more collaborative.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. Other curriculum areas **have not been** neglected because of the emphasis on reading in the RtI Project.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. As a result of RtI our school schedule has changed in a positive direction.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. Parent involvement has increased as a result of the RtI process.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. Parent involvement with the RtI project has increased student progress in reading.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

14. Our parents are pleased with the RtI approach.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

15. RtI is a better way than the IQ-achievement discrepancy model to identify students with specific learning disabilities.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. Our School Assistance Team (SAT) is functioning more effectively as a result of the RtI process.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	NA

17. RtI has had the following effect(s) on the roles of other support personnel in my school (e.g., school psychologist, special education teacher, principals, Title 1 teachers):

18. Other effects experienced so far as result of the RtI process include:
    Positive effects, if any:

    Negative effects, if any:

WHERE YOU STAND

19. Components of the RtI project such as DIBELS and the additional 30-minute instructional block for small groups of struggling students (Tier 2) will increase reading achievement at my school.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. Components of the RtI project (e.g., training, DIBELS, book study) have increased my skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. I am more skilled at teaching the five essential components of reading.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

22. The RtI approach has helped me make a difference in teaching the struggling readers in my classroom (e.g., given me skills, knowledge and/or tools).

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

23. The RtI approach for addressing the needs of struggling readers in the early grades has enabled me to help children before they fail.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24. RtI has allowed me to see potential in each student.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

25. I understand my role in the implementation of the three-tier reading model.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24. I know how to assess students using DIBELS.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

25. I can effectively use DIBELS data to inform my instruction (e.g., grouping students, implementing interventions).

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

26. DIBELS provides important information that allows me to identify specific reading areas in need of intervention.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27. I know how to design specific reading interventions that are matched to student assessment data.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

28. I believe we can sustain RtI after the state support/funding is removed.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SUMMARY

29. What factors in this project are contributing most towards any positive change in the system or for you?

30. What challenges do you anticipate for your classroom, your school, and/or your county in continuing to implement RtI?

31. Given all of the above, what additional or expanded training, supports, or resources are needed?

State level:

Local Level:

32. What other comments or recommendations do you have?

Please insert this form in the envelope provided, seal it and return it to your coordinator by Wednesday, <u>December 21, 2005</u> who will send the unopened forms to the External RtI Evaluation Team. Questions? Ask your project coordinator or call Christina at the RtI Evaluation Team Office at 1-800-642-9842, Ext. 62067.