

1-1-2007

Effective Reading Instruction in a Response to Intervention Program Evaluation

Sabrina L. Graham

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>



Part of the [School Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Graham, Sabrina L., "Effective Reading Instruction in a Response to Intervention Program Evaluation" (2007). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 610.

*Effective Reading Instruction in a Response to
Intervention Program Evaluation*

Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements of the degree of
Educational Specialist School Psychology

By

Sabrina L. Graham

Fred Jay Krieg, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson
Sandra Stroebel, Ph.D.
Stephen O'Keefe, Ph.D.

Marshall University

March 2007

ABSTRACT

Sabrina L. Graham

In response to the reauthorization of IDEA, in the spring of 2005, the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDOE) initiated a project to implement a Response-to-Intervention (RtI) approach to the identification of students with specific learning disabilities. The present study evaluated to what extent the Tier 1 approach provides effective instruction to reach mastery in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics in Kindergarten through 3rd grade. The research design for this study was a program evaluation. The participants in the West Virginia RtI pilot project included approximately 150 teachers from Kindergarten through 3rd grade, 11 principals, 11 project coordinators, and 9 special education directors representing the 11 pilot schools participating in the project. The pre-post survey design was utilized. Analysis of survey data from the 11 schools did not reveal any significant changes over time. Results of this evaluation could not substantiate increase in student reading or increase in teacher skills due to RtI implementation.

*Effective Reading Instruction in a Response to
Intervention Program Evaluation*

Introduction

Since the birth of special education, schools and legislatures have been debating how best to identify students with disabilities. As stated in Moore-Brown, Montgomery, Bielinski, and Shubin (2005)

“this debate presently centers around the combination of three factors: (a) criticism of the use of the discrepancy model (i.e. cognitive referencing) as a basis for diagnosing specific learning disability; (b) criticism of the ‘wait until you fail’ model of special education; and (c) renewed interest in constructs in learning disabilities that rule out limitations of instructional opportunity, especially in the area of reading, as being primarily responsible for a student’s poor achievement”.

The 2004 reauthorization of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) states that schools “shall not be required to take into consideration whether a child has a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability in oral expression, listening comprehension, written expression, basic reading skill, reading comprehension, mathematical calculation, or mathematical reasoning.” (Section 1414(b)). IDEA 2004 states, “In determining whether a child has a specific learning disability, a local educational agency may use a process that determines if the child responds to scientific, research-based intervention...” (Section 1414(b)(6)(B)).

In response to the reauthorization of IDEA, in the spring of 2005, the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDOE) initiated a project to implement a Response-to-Intervention (RtI) approach to the identification of students with specific learning disabilities. The outcomes goals of the project are to (Olsen, 2005):

1. Increase reading skills for ALL children
2. Strengthen early intervention and prevention of reading difficulties for struggling readers
3. Support and further professional development in reading for all teachers
4. Create a process that provides for the appropriate identification of students with LD
5. Reduce referral rates to special education.

The West Virginia RtI pilot project involves a three-tiered approach to reading instruction that begins with high quality reading instruction at the first tier for all students. This high quality reading instruction consists 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. For students who are not successful at tier one, the second tier involves implementation of other research-based interventions and continued measurement of the students' responses to the intervention. Finally, a student who is not successful at tier two interventions undergoes a battery of tests to identify the cognitive and social factors that impede learning to read. This tier three intervention is the first special education intervention. Progression through the tiers increases the time and intensity of instruction as the number of students within each tier decreases.

Statement of Hypothesis

The present study evaluated to what extent the Tier 1 approach provides effective instruction to reach mastery in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics in Kindergarten

through 3rd grade. Such results are important to add to a developing national knowledge base for teachers, school personnel, and education policymakers when implementing a Response to Intervention approach. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

1. Staff will report that their students are better readers as a result of the RtI project.
2. Staff will report that they are skilled at teaching the 5 components of reading as a result of the RtI project.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this program evaluation will be used to assess the West Virginia RtI pilot project. The results will be used to make modifications for future RtI sites. It is important to know how effective Tier I reading instruction is in teaching the 5 basic components of reading and thereby producing better readers.

Definition of Terms

There are several terms that are central to this study. These include: Response to Intervention (RtI), learning disability, and focus group.

The Response to Intervention model that was utilized in the West Virginia RtI pilot project was a three-tier reading model consisting of six components: (1) universal early screening to determine readiness for reading and inform classroom instructions (three times per year, using DIBELS), (2) focus of scientific based reading research for early intervention for struggling readers, (3) high quality research-based instruction in 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 given additional instructional time at 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 given a battery of test to determine cognitive and social factors that impeded their learning to read. Progression through the tiers increases the time and intensity of the instruction and decreases the number of students involved. Tier three was the first special education intervention. However, not all schools progressed to the third tier by completion of the pilot project.

The federal definition (IDEA, 2004, §300.8) 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 does 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."

IDEA 2004 addresses the use of RtI 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 LD -- an alternative to the ability-achievement discrepancy criterion. In addition, IDEA creates 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."

The definition of a focus group is: “Focus groups are a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined environment.” (Smithson, 2000, p. 104). In the case of this program evaluation the purpose of the focus group was to assess positive and negative outcomes of the RtI implementation in the 11 pilot schools. There has been ongoing debate about the appropriate use of focus groups, most researchers agree that they are useful to identify themes and issues in areas where there is little research (Boardman, Arguelles, Vaughn, Hughes, and Klingner, 2005).

LITERATURE REVIEW

In response to a Congressional mandate to help parents, teachers, and policymakers identify key skills and methods central to reading achievement, the National Reading Panel (NRP) issued a report in 2000. The NRP reviewed more than 100,000 studies in the areas of alphabets (phonemic awareness and phonics), fluency, comprehension, teacher education and reading instruction, and computer technology and reading instruction in order to identify methods that consistently relate to reading success. The results of the NRP report identified five necessary components of good reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

As described by Foorman and Torgesen (2001) the NRP report revealed that

(1) phonemic awareness instruction causes improvement in students' phonemic awareness, reading, and spelling (with effect sizes in spelling for students with reading disabilities being weak); and (2) phonemic awareness instruction is most effective when (a) alphabetic letters are included, (b) there are fewer rather than more manipulations of phonemic units, and (c) instruction is conducted in small groups.

These findings led the NRP to identify phonemic awareness as one of the five necessary components of good reading instruction noting that "phonemic awareness is a key component that can contribute significantly to the effectiveness of beginning reading and spelling instruction, there is obviously much more that needs to be taught to children to enable them to acquire reading and writing competence. Phonemic awareness instruction is intended only as a critical foundational piece".

Foorman and Torgesen (2001) also described the findings of the NRP report in regards to phonics:

(1) systematic phonics instruction produces significant benefits for students with

reading disabilities, regardless of socioeconomic status; (2) the impact is strongest in kindergarten and first grade; and (3) phonics must be integrated with instruction in phonemic awareness, fluency, and comprehension.

Again, based on these findings the NRP identified phonics as one of the five necessary components of good reading instruction noting that “phonics instruction should be integrated with other reading instruction to create a balanced reading program”.

The third necessary component to good reading instruction identified in the NRP report was fluency. Fluency was identified as an important component as it “represents a level of expertise beyond word recognition accuracy, and reading comprehension may be aided by fluency”. The report found that “classroom practices that encourage repeated oral reading with feedback and guidance leads to meaningful improvements in reading expertise for students”. Interestingly the report did not find evidence to support independent silent reading as a means for improving reading achievement hence the need for more explicit rather than implicit approaches for improving reading fluency.

Despite the lack of studies regarding vocabulary that satisfied the NRP criteria for inclusion, a review of the collective research indicates that vocabulary increases with instruction of many different sorts. As oral vocabulary is an important part in making the transition from oral to written forms and reading vocabulary is crucial to reading comprehension, vocabulary has been identified as the fourth necessary component in good reading instruction.

The fifth component identified by the NRP reports as necessary for good reading instruction is comprehension. Comprehension strategies are specific procedures that guide students to become aware of how well they are comprehending as they attempt to

read and write. Explicit or formal instruction on these strategies is believed to lead to improvements in text understanding and information use (NRP, 2000).

As stated in Foorman and Torgesen (2001) “there is converging evidence from the psychology of reading and reading growth that the components identified in instructional research are all related directly to the skills and knowledge that are critically important to becoming a skilled reader”. Considering all we know about the science of reading one would think that by applying the lessons of scientific findings, most reading failure could be avoided. However, in a study by the National Council on Teacher Quality (2006) which analyzed 222 required courses in 72 elementary education programs across the nation it was revealed that “only 11 out of 72 institutions (15 percent) were found to actually teach all the components of the science of reading”.

The National Council of Teacher Quality (NCTQ) study analyzed courses to assess the degree to which the five components for reading instruction were taught. The study found that most education schools were not teaching the science of reading, in fact nearly one third of the institutions made no reference to reading science in their courses. The study further revealed that of the 222 courses analyzed only 93 met the criteria for teaching a balanced literacy approach.

The NCTQ study revealed that the “two newest components of good reading instruction – phonemic awareness and fluency – were broached in the fewest classes, just one in 20. In contrast, phonics, long the linchpin of reading, was taught in one out of seven classes, with slightly more frequency than comprehension, arguably the hallmark component for the whole language approach”. These results may indicate that college professors are not teaching what they themselves do not understand; furthermore they are

not assigning texts which teach the science of reading. “Of the 226 texts that were required reading, literacy experts were able to identify only four that would be acceptable as general textbooks for a reading course because they incorporated the science of reading. These four acceptable texts were used in only eleven of 222 courses.”

Not only did the NCTQ study reveal that education programs are not teaching the science of reading but in fact much of the current reading instruction is incompatible with the science. Further all methods of reading instruction are being presented as equally valid approaches.

Despite all we know regarding the five essential components of reading instruction teacher education programs across the nation are producing teachers who are not trained in teaching the science of reading. Foorman and Torgesen (2001) identified critical elements of classroom and small-group instruction that promote reading success in all children. They specifically stated that “instruction for children who enter school with severe weaknesses in talent and preparation for learning to read must be more explicit and comprehensive than is typically provided in the regular classroom”.

In a 1999 study by Torgesen, Wagner, Rashotte, Rose, Lindamood, Conway, & Garvin found that of three interventions tested, “only the most explicit intervention produced a reliable difference in growth of word-reading ability over children who were not provided with any special interventions”.

“More explicit and comprehensive instruction logically implies that skills and knowledge must be directly taught, which in turn logically requires more instructional time” (Foorman & Torgesen, 2001). Another critical element of instruction is that it must not only be explicit and comprehensive but must be more intensive. “The most practical

method for increasing instructional intensity for small numbers of highly at-risk students is to provide small-group instruction”. A final element of instruction identified is that instruction must be both emotionally and cognitively supportive.

The 2006 NCTQ study stated that in order to reduce the failure rate, elementary classrooms must incorporate certain research-based practices. These practices include:

- “Early identification of children at risk of reading failure.
- Daily training in linguistic and oral skills to build awareness of speech sounds, or phonemes.
- Explicit instruction in letter sounds, syllables, and words accompanied by explicit instruction in spelling.
- Teaching phonics in the sequence that research has found leads to the least amount of confusion, rather than teaching it in a scattered fashion and only when children encounter difficulty.
- Practicing skills to the point of automaticity so that children do not have to think about sounding a word when they need to focus on meaning.
- Concurrently with all the above, building comprehension skills and vocabulary knowledge through reading aloud, discussing, and writing about quality children’s literature and nonfiction topics.
- Frequent assessment and instructional adjustments to make sure children are making progress.”

In other words, elementary classrooms must incorporate the five essentials components of reading instruction as well as early identification of those at-risk, complete frequent assessment, and perform on-going progress-monitoring.

The Response to Intervention (RtI) model, which was authorized to be used by local education agencies by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004), emphasizes the critical components of instruction identified by Foorman and Torgesen (2001). Batsche et al. (2005) define RtI as “the practice of (1) providing high-quality instruction/intervention matched to student needs and (2) using learning rate over time and level of performance to (3) make important educational decisions. These three components of RtI are essential”. Batsche et. al. (2005) describe

the core principles of RtI: we can effectively teach all children, intervene early, use a multi-tier model of service delivery, use a problem-solving method to make decisions within a multi-tier model, use research-based, scientifically validated interventions/instruction to the extent available, monitor student progress to inform instruction, use data to make decisions, and use assessment for three different purposes (screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring).

“Teachers’ perceptions of students’ performance in classroom activities influence daily teaching decisions such as the selection of instructional materials, the development of teaching strategies, and the determination of student-learning groups” (Clark & Peterson, 1986; McNair, 1978; Sharpley & Edgar, 1986 as cited in Eckart, Dunn, Coddling, Begeny, & Kleinmann, 2006). Given the significant role of teacher judgments in assessing students’ academic achievement the accuracy of these perceptions is very important.

While previous research examining the accuracy of teachers’ judgments in assessing academic achievement has relied on norm-referenced tests to obtain measures of student achievement, a 2006 study by Eckart et al uses a direct estimate of students’ skill levels in basic areas (Curriculum-Based Measurement). The study examined two second-grade teachers’ estimates of reading and mathematics skills of 33 second-grade students. Results of the study indicated “teachers were not accurate in assessing their students’ mathematics functioning” and “ in reading, teachers’ judgment varied as a function of grade-level material and instructional level. Specifically, teachers experienced considerable difficulty accurately identifying students who were reading at a Mastery

level in grade-level or above-grade-level material”. This study indicated that teachers’ perceptions of student academic achievement were not accurate.

Method

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 education (Mertler & Charles, 2005). There are several methods by which program evaluation can be completed in educational settings. The main methods used for this evaluation were measuring school staff acceptance and resulting changes that were made. Data for monitoring teacher acceptance of a program was obtained from the teacher and others directly involved in delivering the program. To look at changes produced in teachers' skills regarding reading instruction and student reading ability 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):

- Reading First or a 3-tier reading model;
- A committed school level administrator to provide site based leadership;
- A strong School Assistance Team (SAT) with procedures already in place and an “intervention vs. accommodations” approach for at risk students;
- Personnel available to collect baseline data, implement tier two intervention, conduct progress monitoring, and document student response to interventions (e.g., special educator, Title I teacher, school psychologist, diagnostician, or reading mentor teacher);

- Tier two instructional materials and trained staff;
- Made a qualified/certified special educator available to implement tier three interventions and document student progress;
- Made tier three instructional materials available and ensured that staff is adequately trained;
- Made technology available for collection and management of intervention data; and
- Participated in the Phonemic Awareness Project

The participants in the West Virginia RtI pilot project included approximately 150 teachers from Kindergarten through 3rd grade, 11 principals, 11 project coordinators, and 9 special education directors representing 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 from the pre and post implementation surveys were December – 90% (208) and March – 83% (191).

Instrument

The survey distributed to all RtI pilot school participants was developed by the West Virginia Response to Intervention Program Evaluation Team at Marshall University. The survey was then submitted to the West Virginia State Department of Education (WVDOE), Office of Special Education where it was edited before receiving final approval. Survey questions were designed to answer the identified evaluation questions. The survey (see Appendix 1) consists of 28 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 has 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 reading.

The individual interview questions were developed by Dr. Ken Olsen, lead researcher, in collaboration with the external evaluation team. Questions were then sent to the WVDOE, Office of Special Education where they were edited before receiving final approval. The questions were designed to gather information from participating teachers regarding how the Tier I reading program operates in each of the pilot schools. In addition, a question regarding Tier II implementation was included in the interviews.

Procedure

The pre-post survey design was utilized. The same survey was to be 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 will represent 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 analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the purpose of analyzing student reading ability and staff teaching ability a matched t-test was utilized. Qualitative data was analyzed through the identification of common categorical themes.

In addition to the surveys, the external evaluation team conducted interviews February 15-28, 2006 with randomly selected teachers (2 from each grade level), representing each of the 11 pilot schools. Prior to the interviews, schools were notified by the WVDOE, Office of Special Education which teachers were selected to participate in the interviews, as well as a list of alternates. The principals from each school were responsible for providing private space in which to conduct the interviews. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes.

Two members from the external evaluation team were selected based on geographical location and availability to conduct interviews at each pilot school. Prior to arriving at each school, the evaluators agreed on roles of either interviewer or recorder for each session.

Interviews were conducted in private rooms with one teacher and two evaluators. The designated interviewer began with an introduction consisting of: introduction of the

interviewer and recorder, purpose of the interview, how results will be used, and an explanation of confidentiality. The interview process followed the predetermined interview format . During the interview the recorder took hand or type-written notes.

Following the conclusion of all interviews within each school, the two evaluators summarized data based in the individual interview notes, and provided a rating for each grade and for the site as a whole. The 3 point rating scale was used with 1=not being implemented at all 2 = being implemented somewhat, and 3=ideal implementation. Information from this rating scale can be quantitatively analyzed; however, for this particular research question only the interviews qualitative data was analyzed, through the identification of common categorical themes.

During visits to each pilot school the two evaluators also conducted focus groups consisting of 6-8 teachers and interventionists. The focus groups participants were a convenience sample from each pilot school. They received a stipend from the WVDOE, Office of Special Education for participation. Prior to the focus groups, evaluators agreed on the roles of facilitator/moderator and assistant moderator/recorder. The focus groups were held in private rooms, utilizing a round table discussion format.

Each focus group session began with an introduction consisting of: introduction of the facilitator/moderator and the assistant moderator/recorder, purpose of the session, explanation of confidentiality, explanation of recording procedures, and discussion of ground rules.

Following the introduction, focus group participants were asked to write down their initial thoughts regarding positive and negative outcomes of RtI implementation in their school. Each participant was then asked to share one comment from his or her list.

Comments were then used by the facilitator/moderator to initiate a group discussion. The facilitator/moderator had a list of probing questions to facilitate the discussion as needed. The assistant moderator/recorder wrote or typed notes throughout the focus group session. In addition, each session was tape recorded to facilitate analysis. Focus groups will be analyzed qualitatively by categorically sorting comments by probe and/or theme.

Additional focus groups were conducted with pilot principals and special education directors on February 22, 2006 at a centrally designated location. Principals and special education directors were notified of the date and location by the WVDOE, Office of Special Education. Special education directors and principals were separated into two groups, meeting in different rooms. The same procedures utilized in the teacher focus groups were used with the special education directors and principals.

RESULTS

Survey Data

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent the Tier 1 approach provides effective instruction to reach mastery in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics in Kindergarten through 3rd grade. A matched pairs t-test was used to evaluate teachers' ratings regarding the reading program over time for each question related to reading instruction.

- Question 20: Components of the RtI project (e.g. training, DIBELS, book study) have increased my skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction. $t(229) = .245, p > .05$.
- Question 21: I am more skilled at teaching the five essential components of reading. $t(229) = -.667, p > .05$.
- 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). $t(229) = -.839, p > .05$.
- Question 23: The RtI approach for addressing the needs of struggling readers in the early grades has enabled me to help children before they fail. $t(229) = -.630, p > .05$.
- Question 26: DIBELS provides important information that allows me to identify specific reading areas in need of intervention. $t(229) = 1.543, p > .05$.
- Question 27: I know how to design specific reading interventions that are matched to student assessment data. $t(229) = .278, p > .05$.

The comparison of early implementation with mid implementation data for each question related to reading instruction indicates that teachers' evaluation of the reading program did not significantly change with regards to becoming more skilled at teaching the five components of reading, making a difference in teaching struggling readers, and addressing the needs of readers before they fail. Negative changes were reported regarding RtI increasing skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction, identifying areas in need of intervention, and designing interventions to match needs. These results failed to support the null hypotheses.

Survey data was further analyzed by individual schools, using a matched pairs t-test to evaluate teachers' ratings regarding the reading program over time for each question related to reading instruction. Of the 11 schools that participated there were no significant changes reported in 8 of the schools. The following significant changes were found:

School 3:

- Question 20: Components of the RtI project (e.g. training, DIBELS, book study) have increased my skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction. $t(229) = 2.44, p < .05$.
- Question 26: DIBELS provides important information that allows me to identify specific reading areas in need of intervention. $t(229) = 2.731, p < .05$.
- Question 27: I know how to design specific reading interventions that are matched to student assessment data. $t(229) = 3.598, p < .05$.

School 4:

- Question 21: I am more skilled at teaching the five essential components of reading. $t(229) = -2.555, p < .05$.
- 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). $t(229) = -2.223, p < .05$.

School 11:

- Question 20: Components of the RtI project (e.g. training, DIBELS, book study) have increased my skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction. $t(229) = -2.325, p < .05$.
- Question 21: I am more skilled at teaching the five essential components of reading. $t(229) = -2.314, p < .05$.

Focus Group and Interview Data

A qualitative analysis was completed on the information derived from the focus groups and interviews with the participating teachers of the 11 pilot project schools. The following are some statement that teachers made regarding RtI components of the reading program.

- “Positive – struggling readers are given more attention.”
- “Frustration with this is that if the skills have improved, it’s because we have done it ourselves. It was not the result of this pilot project. Not a lot of staff development about it. State has to step it up, and identify all positives and negatives to each (reading) program, and identify supplemental programs that each county can use to supplement programs to identify different areas of reading.

If this is a special education issue, then we still have to pay for these supplements.”

- “On the five components of reading, every Pre-K and K teacher needs to be focused on this. Each teacher needs to be trained and keep people on the same page. Training needs to be ongoing.”
- “I have been through a lot of reading programs but I like the fact that DIBELS is research based and using research proven materials is beneficial.”
- “I feel like I am a better reading teacher because of this.”
- “Has improved the reading skills a lot – it just needed to start out another way.”
- “In the past I always taught phonemic awareness, but didn’t get the importance of it. I have changed my focus that phonemic awareness is more important than writing or reading a word.”
- “I do have some kids that I thought would never read, but they’re reading. So what? What are they losing out on? What if we waited to teach reading later?”
- “RtI not necessarily put to us as a reading program, but it is. It is consuming all of the good stuff we had. We liked what we already had. DIBELS only makes it bits and pieces, no one wants to teach like this.”
- “I see children who absolutely love to read, and they’re not told to. The kids will pull out books in free time, they wouldn’t before.”

DISCUSSION

This study examined the extent to which the Tier 1 approach provides effective instruction to reach mastery in Phonemic Awareness and Phonics in Kindergarten through 3rd grade. This was examined through survey questions addressing topics such as: increasing teacher skills, increasing teacher knowledge, addressing the needs of students, making a difference in teaching readers, designing interventions, and providing information.

It was hypothesized that staff would report that their students are better readers as a result of the RtI project and also that staff would report that they were skilled at teaching the 5 components of reading as a result of the RtI project. While positive changes were reported in becoming more skilled at teaching the five components of reading, making a difference in teaching struggling readers, and addressing the needs of readers before they fail, negative changes were also reported regarding RtI increasing skills and knowledge relevant to reading instruction, identifying areas in need of intervention, and designing interventions to match needs. These results cannot attribute increases in student reading or increases in teachers skills to RtI implementation.

Analysis of survey data within individual schools revealed significant changes in 3 of the 11 schools. These findings may indicate that differences within schools (i.e. differences in training made available by state, differences in resources and staff, etc) may have been a contributing factor in the effectiveness of the RtI model within schools.

Interview and focus group data revealed both positive and negative feeling towards the reading program implemented by the RtI pilot project. Several teachers commented that they saw improvements in students' interest in reading as well as their

reading abilities. Positive comments were also made regarding the importance of training in the areas of the phonemic awareness and the five components of reading. There were concerns noted that the reading programs used in the RtI process were not any better than the programs they replaced, as well as frustration that the state did not identify programs and supplemental programs to be used.

Although some teachers reported in the focus groups and interviews that they witnessed improvements in student reading abilities as well as in their own skills at teaching, the overall survey data could not attribute any positive changes as a result of the RtI implementation.

LIMITATIONS

This study contains several important limitations that should be noted. First, the survey, interview, and focus group data collected in this study were really a measure of participant perception. Second, this study tried to draw conclusions about student and teacher skills based on teachers' perceptions. Research discussed by Eckert et al. (2006) revealed how teacher judgments of student achievement are not accurate. Third, the limited amount of data collected was all based on teacher perceptions. No data was collected on the actual performance of students. Having access to students' DIBEL data and movement between tiers would have contributed less subjective data especially for the research questions addressed in this particular study. Furthermore, the exact level of participant understanding regarding RtI going into the project as well as throughout the project varied among participants due to prior personal exposure and ongoing training provided to select pilot sites. Lack of understanding may have led to reported frustration

reported by participants throughout the pilot project and ultimately effected the lack of positive changes reported.

Implications and Future Research Directions

Important limitations identified by the current study provide insight for how the current study could have been better and how to improve future studies. For example, because the survey and interview questions were edited by the WVDOE, Office of Special Education prior to distribution they were worded to yield favorable results. To ensure the validity of data, survey and interview questions should remain neutral.

The current study failed to survey participants pre-implementation, making it difficult to draw conclusions from the collected data. Surveys conducted pre-implementation, mid-implementation, and then post-implementation would provide better information with regards to a change in the effectiveness of reading instruction.

Any differences in implementation between schools should be examined to determine their effect. Future research should ensure that factors such as training and resources are consistent between schools.

Future research should examine statewide test results of students in RtI models using a pre-post test design over time to follow student progress. In addition future research should examine student progress throughout the RtI model by examining assessment and progress-monitoring data collected.

References

- Batsche, G., Elliot, 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*. National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc.
- Boardman, A.G., Arguelles, M.E., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M.T., & Klinger, J. (2005). Special education teachers' views of research-based practices. *The Journal of Special Education, 39*, 168-180.
- Eckert, T.L., Dunn, E.K., Coddling, R.S., Begeny, J.C., & Kleinmann, A.E. (2006). Assessment of Mathematics and Reading Performance: An Examination of the Correspondance Between Direct Assessment of Student Performance and Teacher Report. *Psychology of the Schools, 43*, 247-262.
- Foorman, B.R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical Elements of Classroom and Small-Group Instruction Promote Reading Success in All Children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 16*, 203-212.
- Individuals with Disabilities in Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004, PL 108-446, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 et. seq.
- Mertler, C.A., & Charles, C.M. (2005). *Introduction to Educational Research* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based Assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

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

Smithson, J. (2000). Using and analyzing focus groups: limitations and possibilities.

Social Research Methodology, 3, 103-119.

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 Question 20 Mid-Implementation and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations $p > .05$

| | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mid | 229 | 4.35 | 2.148 |
| Post | 229 | 4.31 | 2.405 |

Table 2

Comparison of Question 21 Mid-Implementation and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations $p > .05$

| | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mid | 229 | 4.03 | 2.255 |
| Post | 229 | 4.16 | 2.488 |

Table 3

Comparison of Question 22 Mid-Implementation and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations $p > .05$

| | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mid | 229 | 3.99 | 2.346 |
| Post | 229 | 4.14 | 2.489 |

Table 4

Comparison of Question 23 Mid-Implementation and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations $p > .05$

| | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mid | 229 | 4.01 | 2.282 |
| Post | 229 | 4.14 | 2.489 |

Table 5

Comparison of Question 26 Mid-Implementation and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations $p > .05$

| | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mid | 229 | 5.11 | 2.270 |
| Post | 229 | 4.81 | 2.598 |

Table 6

Comparison of Question 27 Mid-Implementation and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations $p > .05$

| | Number | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Mid | 229 | 4.63 | 2.288 |
| Post | 229 | 4.57 | 2.483 |

Table 7

School 1

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | -.158 | 3.484 | -.198 | .846 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | -.421 | 3.934 | -.466 | .646 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | -.316 | 4.028 | -.342 | .737 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -.684 | 4.001 | -.745 | .466 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | -.316 | 3.787 | -.364 | .720 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | -.842 | 3.760 | -.976 | .3423 |

Table 8

School 2

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | .600 | 1.957 | 1.188 | .255 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | .467 | 2.200 | .822 | .425 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | .667 | 1.988 | 1.299 | .215 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | .867 | 1.685 | 1.992 | .066 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | .600 | 1.882 | 1.235 | .237 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | .067 | 2.251 | .115 | .910 |

Table 9

School 3

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | 1.217 | 2.392 | 2.440 | .023 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | 1.087 | 3.204 | 1.627 | .118 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | .696 | 3.007 | 1.110 | .279 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | .783 | 2.779 | 1.351 | .191 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | 1.435 | 2.519 | 2.731 | .012 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | 1.870 | 2.492 | 3.598 | .002 |

Table 10

School 4

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | -.565 | 2.826 | -.959 | .348 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | -1.696 | 3.183 | -2.555 | .018 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | -1.478 | 3.189 | -2.223 | .037 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -1.000 | 2.954 | -1.623 | .119 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | .000 | 3.247 | .000 | 1.000 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | -.870 | 3.181 | -1.311 | .203 |

Table 11

School 5

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | .833 | 2.431 | 1.454 | .164 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | .278 | 2.024 | .582 | .568 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | .000 | 2.351 | .000 | 1.000 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -.389 | 3.292 | -.501 | .623 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | .389 | 2.768 | .596 | .559 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | .333 | 3.029 | .467 | .647 |

Table 12

School 6

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | -.433 | 1.612 | -1.472 | .152 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | -.533 | 1.676 | -1.743 | .092 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | -.133 | 1.332 | -.548 | .588 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | .333 | 1.863 | .980 | .335 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | -.333 | 2.578 | -.708 | .484 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | -.667 | 2.578 | .296 | .167 |

Table 13

School 7

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | 1.588 | 4.570 | 1.433 | .171 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | 1.471 | 4.652 | 1.303 | .211 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | 1.118 | 5.011 | .920 | .371 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | 1.176 | 4.517 | 1.074 | .299 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | 1.588 | 4.473 | 1.464 | .163 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | 1.412 | 4.731 | 1.230 | .236 |

Table 14

School 8

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | .150 | 2.084 | .322 | .751 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | .250 | 1.916 | .584 | .566 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | -.250 | 1.773 | -.630 | .536 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -.250 | 2.693 | -.415 | .683 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | .650 | 2.207 | 1.317 | .203 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | .350 | 2.033 | .770 | .451 |

Table 15

School 9

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | -.154 | 1.994 | -.939 | .697 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | -.038 | 1.990 | -.099 | .922 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | .115 | 2.065 | .285 | .778 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -.231 | 2.233 | -.527 | .603 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | .385 | 2.483 | .790 | .437 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | .346 | 2.382 | .741 | .466 |

Table 16

School 10

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | -.421 | 1.774 | -1.035 | .315 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | -.158 | 2.141 | -.321 | .752 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | -.684 | 2.029 | -1.470 | .159 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -.895 | 2.447 | -1.594 | .128 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | .105 | 2.726 | .168 | .868 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | -.421 | 3.043 | -.603 | .554 |

Table 17

School 11

| | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Sig. (2-tail) |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Pair 1 Q20 Pre-Post | -1.632 | 3.059 | -2.325 | .032 |
| Pair 2 Q21 Pre-Post | -1.526 | 2.875 | -2.314 | .033 |
| Pair 3 Q22 Pre-Post | -1.158 | 2.930 | -1.723 | .102 |
| Pair 4 Q23 Pre-Post | -.947 | 3.118 | -1.325 | .202 |
| Pair 5 Q26 Pre-Post | -.842 | 3.149 | -1.166 | .259 |
| Pair 6 Q27 Pre-Post | -.684 | 3.449 | -.865 | .399 |

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 at this point in time.
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 **Wednesday, December 21, 2005**.

A word about confidentiality:

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 |
|---|----------------|---|---|---------|---|---|-------------------|----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | NA |

(August 2005)

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 | | | | Neutral | | | Strongly |
|----------|--|--|--|---------|--|--|----------|

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Agree 7

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

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 Neutral 4 5 6 Strongly Agree 7 Not Applicable 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 1 2 3 Neutral 4 5 6 Strongly Agree 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 1 2 3 Neutral 4 5 6 Strongly Agree 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, December 21, 2005 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.