

Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised

Description & Purpose

Theoretical Background

The *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* is a self-report measure that was developed by Project staff to assess educators' perceptions of the skills they possess to implement Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/RtI) practices. Research suggests the likelihood of embracing new practices increases when two conditions exist: (1) Educators understand the need for the practice, and (2) perceive that they either have the skills to implement the practice or will receive support to develop the required skills. Various professional development designs exist that have resulted in the majority of educators developing the skills to implement new practices (e.g., professional learning communities, coaching, action research, study groups; Croft et al., 2010; Learning Forward, 2011). However, variables such as the quality of professional development delivered and how difficult skills are to acquire will influence the extent to which educators develop the skills necessary to implement PS/RtI practices. Therefore, understanding current educator perceptions of the skills they possess and how those perceptions change as a function of professional development should provide valuable information to educators facilitating PS/RtI implementation.

Description

The *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* contains items that assess the amount of support educators perceive is required for them to successfully implement PS/RtI practices. Specifically, the instrument contains 50 items that assess skills in applying PS/RtI practices to academic and behavior content as well as skills in data manipulation and technology use. (The 50 items are organized within 16 stems reflecting core skills.) Examples of skills assessed include accessing and using student data to make decisions related to academic and behavioral instruction/intervention, utilizing the problem-solving process to address student concerns, and using graphing and technology to facilitate progress monitoring. Educators select from the following scale when responding to items on the survey: 1 = I do not have the skill at all (NS); 2 = I have minimal skills in this area; need substantial support to use it (MnS); 3 = I have the skills, but still need some support to use it (SS); 4 = I can use this skill with little support (HS); 5 = I am highly skilled in this area and

The revised version contains fewer items than the original *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey*. See the first version of this manual, located on the Project website, for information on the original version.

could teach others this skill (VHS).

Purpose

The purpose of the instrument is two-fold. The first purpose is to assess the impact of professional development efforts on educators' perceptions of the data-based decision making skills they possess. Second, identifying educators' comfort level with PS/RtI practices can inform professional development needs as well as the allocation of resources to support skill development. By using data to inform ongoing professional development, stakeholders can determine the extent to which professional development activities are resulting in increased skill levels as well as make adjustments to professional development plans when necessary.

Intended Audience

Who Should Complete the Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey?

School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) members complete the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*. SBLTs are comprised of approximately six to eight staff members selected to take a leadership role in facilitating PS/RtI implementation in a school. Staff included on the SBLT should have the following roles represented: administration, general education teachers, student services, special education teachers, and content specialists (e.g., reading, math, behavior). SBLT members should receive training on the PS/RtI model including strategies for facilitating implementation (i.e., systems change principles and strategies referred to in the Introduction). Individuals on the team also should adopt roles and responsibilities to ensure efficient and productive planning and problem-solving meetings. Important responsibilities include a **facilitator**, **time-keeper**, **data coach**, and **recorder**, in addition to providing expertise in the particular content areas or disciplines listed above.

All instructional staff not represented on the SBLT also complete the instrument. Common instructional staff includes general education teachers, special education teachers, and those that assist with delivering curriculum and interventions to students (e.g., student services personnel, reading specialists, interventionists).

Who Should Use the Results for Decision Making?

The SBLTs who complete the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* should receive the results for their school. District-Based Leadership Team (DBLT) members also should receive the results for the district's schools individually as well as aggregated at the district level. Members of the DBLT provide leadership to schools implementing PS/RtI practices. Examples of leadership provided by DBLT members include facilitating the creation of policies and procedures to support implementation, providing access to professional development targeting the knowledge and skills of educators in the district, and meeting with schools to review implementation and student outcomes. Staff included on the team mirror the SBLT in terms of representation of disciplines and roles and responsibilities.

Facilitator:

Responsibilities of facilitators tend to include preparation for meetings, ensuring participation and involvement of team members, encouraging team members to reach consensus regarding decisions being made, and keeping the conversations focused on the task being discussed (e.g., problem-solving student performance, planning for professional development).

Timekeeper:

Timekeepers are responsible for providing periodic updates to team members regarding the amount of time left to complete a given task or discussion during meetings.

Data Coach:

Data coaches provide assistance with interpreting data and using it to inform decisions.

Recorder: Recorders are responsible for taking notes for the purpose of capturing the important discussions and outcomes of meetings.

Results of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* also should be shared with instructional staff in the buildings that complete the instrument. Sharing the results with instructional staff can be used as a strategy for facilitating discussions about professional development needs (e.g., training and coaching targets) and obtain input from staff regarding alternative ways to support the school's PS/RtI initiative (e.g., using technology to scaffold components of PS/RtI practices).

Directions for Administration

Methods of Administration

The *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* can be administered in venues such as trainings, staff meetings, or grade-level meetings. The survey also may be administered through dissemination in staff mailboxes with directions for returning the survey. Finally, the instrument can be administered electronically through district supported or commercially available technology resources (e.g., SurveyMonkey®). Regardless of the method chosen to administer the surveys, every effort should be made to ensure high return rates from SBLT and staff members to ensure that the information gathered adequately reflects the perceived skills of the school. Following the procedures outlined below for providing directions to educators completing the survey is suggested regardless of the method used.

Directions to Educators Completing the Survey

Prior to administration, it is highly recommended that the building principal explain the reason that the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* is being administered, and why the information obtained is important to the school and district. The Florida PS/RtI Project staff have found that having principals explain the importance of collecting these data can lead to more complete and accurate information returned. After the survey is introduced by the school's principal, individuals responsible for administration (e.g., district-based PS/RtI Coaches, RtI Coordinators, DBLT members) should provide educators with a description of the instrument, the purpose of collecting the data, how the data will be used, and specific instructions for completing the instrument. Specific instructions for completing the survey will vary based on the method used for administration. Regardless of the method selected, it should be clarified that the survey should be completed individually. It is also recommended that individual responses remain anonymous and that opportunities to ask questions be provided.

Frequency of Use

When determining how often educators should complete the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*, it is important to consider the resources available within schools and districts so that plans for data collection are adequately supported. Important considerations include the time needed for completion of the instrument; the time required to enter, analyze, graph, and disseminate data; the personnel available to support data collection, and other data collection activities in which SBLT members and school staff are required to participate. In other words, decisions about how often to collect the data should be made based on the capacity to

administer, analyze, and use the information to inform plans to scale-up PS/RtI implementation.

Although schools and districts will need to make adjustments given available resources, general recommendations for completing the instrument are provided below. General recommendations are to administer the survey:

- Prior to beginning professional development targeting the skills required to implement PS/RtI practices.
- At the end of the first year of professional development activities to determine the extent to which perceived skills changed.
- At least one time each subsequent year to monitor perceived skill levels as implementation efforts continue. Administration at the end of each year can be used to provide information on the relationship between professional development activities and perceived skills during the year as well as serve as a baseline for the impact of next year's activities.

Technical Adequacy

Content Validity Evidence

To inform development of the original version of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey*, Project staff reviewed relevant literature, presentations, instruments and previous program evaluation projects to develop an item set that would be representative of perceived skills important to consider when implementing PS/RtI practices. Next, a draft of the instrument was sent to an Educator Expert Validation Panel (EEVP), which consisted of 14 educators from varying disciplines (e.g., general and special education teachers, school- and district-level administrators, student support services personnel, content specialists) in a neighboring school district who had basic background knowledge in PS/RtI, for review. The Panel provided feedback on the representativeness of the skills covered by the instrument, clarity and quality of the individual items, and suggested modifications to items.

Project staff analyzed panel member feedback and made revisions to the survey using a structured process. Project staff considered 80% agreement among panel members that an item was relevant and well written as the criterion for retaining an item. Feedback from EEVP members for the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey* suggested that major revisions to the survey did not need to occur. A minimum of 80% of members agreed with the item as it was initially written for all items. Although the criterion for keeping an item as written was met for all items, Project staff reviewed any feedback provided by respondents to determine if the suggestions would improve the clarity of the items. Minor wording changes were made to clarify items or make the wording more succinct, but no substantive changes occurred from this discussion.

Construct Validity Evidence

Exploratory common factor analytic procedures were used to determine the underlying factor structure of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey*. A common factor

Content validity: Content-related validity evidence refers to the extent to which the sample of items on an instrument is representative of the area of interest the instrument is designed to measure. In the context of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*, content-related validity evidence is based on expert judgment that the sample of items on the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* is representative of the educator skills needed to implement PS/RtI practices.

Construct validity: Construct-related validity evidence refers to the extent to which the individuals' scores derived from the instrument represent a meaningful measure of a domain or characteristic. In the case of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to assess the internal structure of the instrument and to develop evidence to support the validity of interpretations based on individuals' scores on the resultant factors. Results of the factor analysis suggest that the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* measured three underlying skill domains (or factors).

Internal consistency reliability: Internal consistency reliability evidence is based on the degree of homogeneity of scores (i.e., the extent to which the scores cluster together) on items measuring the same domain. In the context of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*, an internal consistency reliability estimate provides a measure of the extent to which educators' who responded one way to an item measuring a skill domain (or factor) tended to respond the same way to other items measuring the same domain.

analysis was conducted using the responses from a sample of 2,184 educators in 62 schools from eight school districts across Florida. The educators were participants in the Florida PS/RtI Project during the Fall of 2007. Factors were extracted using principal axis factor extraction method. Based on examination of eigenvalues and a scree plot, three factors were retained and rotated using an oblique rotation (Promax) to aid in the interpretability of the factors.

Factor loadings for each item ranged from .33 to .90. The initial version of the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey* retained all items with a loading greater than or equal to .3. The three factors collectively accounted for 80% of the common variance in participant ratings. The three factors were labeled as follows: 1) *Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Academic Content*, 2) *Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Behavior Content*, and 3) *Perceptions of Data Manipulation and Technology Skills*. However, further analysis by Project staff as well as feedback from stakeholders indicating difficulties with administration due to survey length suggested a compelling reason to shorten the survey. Therefore, Project staff eliminated items from the original scale by using a more conservative factor loading cut-off (<.5) as well as professional judgment (Henson & Roberts, 2006). A subsequent EFA of the remaining items was conducted using the procedures outlined above. The EFA procedures resulted in the same three factors described above. The three factors continued to collectively account for 80% of the common variance despite a reduction in the number of items (see *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised: Table 1* in Supplements, page 100 for the final factor solution).

Thus, the results of the common factor analysis suggest that the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* taps into educator perceived skills in three domains: *applying RtI skills to academic content*, *applying RtI skills to behavior content*, and *skills in manipulating data and using technology* to assist in data-based decision-making.

Internal Consistency Reliability

Internal consistency reliability estimates (as measured by Cronbach's alpha) for each of the three factors (domains) yielded by the factor analysis are as follows:

- **Factor 1** (*Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Academic Content*): $\alpha = .98$
- **Factor 2** (*Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Behavior Content*): $\alpha = .97$
- **Factor 3** (*Perceptions of Data Manipulation and Technology Use Skills*): $\alpha = .94$

Reliability estimates for all three factors exceeded the .70 threshold typically used (Nunnally, 1978).

Scoring

Analysis of Responses to the Survey

The Florida PS/RtI Project has utilized two techniques for analyzing survey responses for evaluation purposes. First, the mean rating for each item can be calculated to determine the average perceived skill level reported by staff that com-

pleted the instrument. Second, the frequency of (i.e., frequency distribution) each response option selected (see rating scale above) by staff can be calculated for each survey item.

Calculating item means provides an overall impression of the perceived skill level of educators within a school, district, etc. Calculating average perceived skills can be done at the domain (i.e., factor) and/or individual item levels. Examining perceived skills at the domain level allows educators to examine general patterns in perceived skills applied to (1) academic content, (2) behavior content, and (3) data manipulation and technology use. A domain score for each of the three domains measured by the instrument may be computed for each respondent to the survey by calculating the sum of the ratings of the items that comprise the domain. These values can then be added together and divided by the number of items within the domain to **determine the average level of perceived skills for each domain**. The items that comprise each domain are as follows:

- **Factor One** (*Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Academic Content*): 2A, 3A, 4A1, 4B1, 4C1, 4D1, 4E1, 4F1, 5A, 6A, 7A, 8A, 8C, 8E, 9A, 10A, 11A, 12A, 13A, 15, 16A, 16B, and 16C.
- **Factor Two** (*Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Behavior Content*): 2B, 3B, 4A2, 4B2, 4C2, 4D2, 4E2, 4F2, 5B, 6B, 7B, 8B, 8D, 8F, 9B, 10B, 11B, 12B, 13B, and 16D.
- **Factor Three** (*Perceptions of Data Manipulation and Technology Use Skills*): 14A, 14B, 14C, 14D, 14E, 17A, and 17B.

Average levels of perceived skills also can be examined by item. Calculating the mean rating for each item within a domain allows stakeholders to identify perceived skill levels and support needed by educators. This information can be used to identify specific skills that educators perceive possessing as well as those skills educators tend to report lower levels of that may hinder PS/RtI implementation efforts (see [Year 1 Evaluation Report](#), *Perceptions of RtI Skills* graph [exemplars are based on the original version of the survey], page 35 — Note: the *Year 1 Evaluation Report* does not break down the items by domains).

Calculating the frequency of educators who selected each response option for an item, on the other hand, provides information on the range of perceived skill levels. This information can be used to determine what percentage of educators may require little, some, or high levels of support to implement PS/RtI practices. When planning for professional development, information on the number of educators who report possessing a given skill can help inform decisions regarding what skills to focus on and how much additional support to provide (see [Year 2 Evaluation Report](#), *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey* graphs [exemplars are based on the original version of the survey], pages 45-47).

It is recommended that key stakeholders analyze perceptions of skills data in ways that best inform the evaluation questions they are asking. The data collected from the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* can be used to answer a number of broad and specific questions regarding the extent to which educators perceive

For example, if an educator selected *NS* two times, *MnS* one time, and *SS* four times when completing the 7 items that comprise the “Perceptions of Data Manipulation and Technology Use Skills” domain, the values corresponding with those responses would be added together to obtain a total value of 16 (i.e., $(2 \times 1) + (1 \times 2) + (4 \times 3) = 16$). The total value of 16 would be divided by the number of items (7) to obtain the average domain score (i.e., $16/7 = 2.29$). An average domain score of 2.29 could be interpreted as the educator, on average, perceiving that s/he has minimal data manipulation and technology skills and requires substantial support in that area.

that they possess the skills necessary to implement PS/RtI practices. To facilitate formative decision-making, stakeholders should consider aligning the analysis and display of the data with specific evaluation questions. For example, questions regarding general trends in perceived skills when addressing behavior content may best be answered by calculating and displaying domain scores. Questions about specific perceived skills across a school or district may best be answered by calculating and displaying the number of educators that report having minimal skill, some skill, etc. for a given skill being evaluated. In other words, identifying which evaluation question(s) are currently being answered will guide how to analyze the data and communicate the information to facilitate decision making.

Technology Support

School personnel should consider using district supported or commercially available technology resources to facilitate analyses of the data. Software and web-based programs vary in terms of the extent to which they can support administration of an instrument (e.g., online administration) and automatic analysis of data, as well as how user-friendly they are. Decisions about what technology to use to facilitate analysis should be made based on available resources as well as the knowledge and skills possessed by those responsible for managing and analyzing data from the survey.

Training Required

A brief training is recommended prior to administering the survey. Although administering surveys is common in school settings, issues such as specific administration procedures and the amount of questions administrators are likely to receive about survey content vary. Therefore trainings of individuals responsible for administering the survey should include the components listed below. The contents of this manual can serve as a resource for developing and conducting trainings.

- Theoretical background on the relationship between perceptions of skills and whether educators will adopt new practices
- Description of the instrument including brief information on the items and how they relate to each other (e.g., domains of perceived skills the items assess)
- Administration procedures developed and/or adopted
- Common issues that arise during administration such as frequently asked questions and how to facilitate better return rates from school settings

Training Suggested for Analyzing, Interpreting, and Disseminating Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised Results

The knowledge, skills, and experience of educators in analyzing, interpreting, and using data for formative decision-making vary. If the stakeholders responsible for these activities possess the knowledge and skills required then training specific to the survey may not be necessary. However, should the stakeholders responsible for using the data lack any of the aforementioned skill sets, training and technical

assistance is recommended. Topics on which support might be provided are listed below:

- Appropriate use of the survey given its purpose and technical adequacy
- Guidelines for analyzing and displaying data derived from the survey
- Guidelines for interpreting and disseminating the results

Interpretation & Use of the Data

Examination of Broad Domains

When interpreting data from the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*, it is recommended to begin by examining the three broad domains assessed by the instrument (i.e., *Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Academic Content*, *Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Behavior Content*, and *Perceptions of Data Manipulation and Technology Use Skills*). Educators can examine graphically displayed data to evaluate trends in educator perceived skills within each domain. Each of the methodologies for scoring mentioned above (i.e., calculating average perceived skills at the domain and item levels and calculating the frequency/percent of educators who selected each response option at the item level) can be used to examine the broad domains. One methodology used frequently by Project staff when examining data on perceptions of RtI skills is to take note of the percent of educators who reported being very highly skilled (5) or highly skilled (4); the percent who reported having the skill but still need support to use it (3); as well as the percent of educators who reported having minimal skill (2) or not having the skill at all (1) within each domain. This type of visual analysis (an example this type of graph is provided in the *Year Two Evaluation Report*) allows stakeholders to determine the extent to which educators report possessing the skills, lacking the skills, or possessing some skills but require support to implement PS/RtI practices. This approach can be used to examine perceived skills for any given administration as well as to examine trends over time.

Identification of Specific Needs

After examining data from the broad domains measured by the instrument, it is recommended that teams examine educator responses to individual items. The *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* can be used as an indicator of specific skills and/or skill sets on which educators may require support to be able to implement PS/RtI practices. Identifying items, for example, in which the majority of educators report that they are “Not Skilled” would suggest skills that require further training and coaching support to develop. Conversely, items on which educators report being highly skilled would suggest skills that may require less professional development and support. Comparing data on educator perceived skills with other sources of information is recommended when making decisions about potential professional development targets.

Data Dissemination to Stakeholders

It is recommended that the data be shared with DBLTs, SBLTs, instructional school staff, and any other relevant stakeholders as quickly and frequently as possible following survey administrations. Quick access to the data allows stakeholders in leadership positions (e.g., DBLTs, SBLTs) to discuss the results from the survey, develop or adjust professional development goals, and design training and coaching activities to increase identified skill levels. SBLT members also may share their school's data with instructional school staff who are not members of the SBLT. SBLT members can use the data presented to facilitate consensus-building discussions regarding the rationale for professional development activities and to obtain their input regarding factors that may be contributing to the patterns observed (e.g., access to technology resources, lack of consensus regarding importance of identified skills, more practice opportunities needed).

How to Facilitate Discussions When Sharing Data with Stakeholders

One helpful strategy for facilitating discussions about perceptions of RtI skills data is to provide educators with guiding questions. The use of guiding questions is designed to facilitate discussions about issues such as current skill levels, additional professional development that might be necessary, and goals for developing various skill sets. Listed below are examples of guiding questions used by the Florida PS/RtI Project to facilitate discussions among SBLT members when examining perceptions of RtI skills data. The questions were developed to provide scaffolding when interpreting the data and focus discussions toward using the information to facilitate skill building. However, stakeholders in leadership positions can generate additional guiding questions to better meet their particular needs.

- To what extent do you believe that your building possesses the skills to use school-based data to evaluate core (Tier 1)? Supplemental (Tier 2) instruction?
- Based on what your building has learned about using data to make decisions, how consistent are the skills your building possesses with what you are doing in your building (i.e., to what degree does your building evaluate the effectiveness of core and supplemental instruction)?

School-Level Example of *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* Data

The following example demonstrates how key stakeholders may use data derived from the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* to inform PS/RtI implementation. Data from the instrument are displayed graphically. Following the graph, background information on the school's initiative and an explanation of what is represented on the graph is provided. Finally, ways in which the data were used by the school to monitor progress and identify needs is discussed. Importantly, although the example occurs at the school-level, the concepts discussed can be generalized to other units of analysis (e.g., district-level, state-level).




Figure 6. Example Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised graph.

Explanation of the Graph

The SBLT at Alligator Elementary committed to providing staff members ongoing training and support to help facilitate PS/RtI implementation. Prior to initiating professional development activities, the SBLT decided to assess staff perceived skill levels to inform their professional development activities. Team members administered the *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* to instructional staff members at the beginning of the year. They also decided to administer the survey at the end of the year to examine changes in perceived skills. Because Alligator Elementary had previously identified addressing behavior issues at the school as a need, SBLT members agreed to focus on RtI skills applied to behavior content first. Figure 6 above represents data from the beginning and end of year administrations of the survey. The graph displays items related to their perceptions of RtI skills when addressing behavior content. Notice that two bars are located above each item. These bars represent the two time points in which data were collected (i.e., beginning and end of the year). The yellow bars represent the average perceived skills of the staff at the beginning of the year while the green bars represent their average perceived skills at the end of the year. The values on the y-axis correspond with the five response options outlined above.

Alligator Elementary's Use of the Data for Decision Making

Examination of broad *Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised* domains. When examining staff perceived skills after the first survey administration, Alligator Elementary SBLT members started by visually analyzing the data across items addressing behavior content. Immediately evident across all items displayed in Figure 6 is that the average perceived skill level of staff members at the beginning of the year indicated support would be required. The average staff member reported that they possessed minimal (i.e., represented by a value of 2 on the graph) to some (i.e., represented by a value of 3 on the graph) skills depending on the specific item examined. These responses indicated that staff would require support to apply all PS/RtI practices assessed by the survey to behavior content. SBLT members decided to present the Year 1 data at a staff meeting to build consensus regarding the need for professional development targeting the application of RtI skills to behavior issues as well as gather staff input regarding training and coaching activities.

During the staff meeting at the beginning of the year, SBLT members guided staff through a structured planning and problem-solving process to determine how to address the low levels of skill reported by staff. When interpreting the data, the SBLT member facilitating suggested that staff examine the average skill level across items. Given the pattern of lower average ratings, staff agreed with SBLT members that professional development targeting all skills applied to behavior content would be necessary. The meeting resulted in staff at Alligator Elementary identifying that it would be most helpful for them to develop the required skills by having an SBLT member regularly attend grade-level meetings to model the steps and provide feedback as teachers begin practicing. The staff suggested that having SBLT members demonstrate skills such as conducting a gap analysis (item 4e2) and identifying appropriate data to determine reasons for the problem (item 6b) us-

ing data from their classrooms would help them better understand how to perform the skills independently. SBLT members took this suggestion and incorporated it into a professional development plan in which appropriate meetings to provide the suggested support were identified, personnel assigned, and strategies for providing the support specified.

Identification of specific needs. The data reflected in Figure 6 above at the beginning of the year suggested that staff members required professional development across all applications of PS/RtI skills to behavior content. SBLT members informed staff of their plan to administer the survey again at the end of the year. SBLT and staff members agreed that it would be a good idea to determine how staff perceive their skills at that point to determine the impact of professional development and if any particular needs become evident (see the *Monitoring Perceived Skills Over Time* section below for a discussion regarding specific needs identified by Alligator Elementary following the end of year administration).

Monitoring of perceived skills over time. Prior to the conclusion of the school year, SBLT members and staff compared changes in average skill levels from the beginning to end of the year. Both SBLT members and staff noted an increase in the staff's perceptions of skills when addressing behavior content across all items. Next, they identified those items that suggested substantial growth in perceived skills. Skills on which staff reported requiring less support across the year included defining concerns in terms of replacement behaviors (item 4a2); and using data to define current (item 4b2), desired (item 4c2) and peer (item 4d2) levels of performance. Then, participants identified those skills in which staff members' responses indicated little or no growth. Examples of skills identified included accessing data to determine the percent of students achieving benchmarks in core instruction (item 2b) and identifying appropriate data to use for developing hypotheses (item 6b). The SBLT and staff discussed the items that remained low despite professional development efforts to increase these skills throughout the year. A facilitator guided the staff through the same structured planning and problem-solving process used previously to create a plan for addressing those skill areas during the next school year. The school identified that their goal was to talk with the district leadership regarding developing a better school-wide data system for behavior data. They believed that this action would help teachers more easily access and use student behavior data reflected in the skills assessed by items such as 2b (Access data to determine the percent of students achieving benchmarks in core instruction), 4e2 (Calculate the gap between current performance and benchmark expectations), and 6b (Identifying appropriate data to use for developing hypotheses). SBLT members and staff decided that a behavior data system that was structured and user-friendly would make the skill level required to access and use behavior data less difficult.

Problem Solving/Response to Intervention

Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised

Developed by the Florida PS/RtI Statewide Project — <http://floridarti.usf.edu>

The skill to:	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
<hr/>					
b. Use data to define the current level of performance of the target student for:					
• Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
• Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
c. Determine the desired level of performance (i.e., benchmark) for:					
• Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
• Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
d. Determine the current level of peer performance for the same skill as the target student for:					
• Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
• Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
e. Calculate the gap between student current performance and the benchmark (district grade level standard) for:					
• Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
• Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
f. Use gap data to determine whether core instruction should be adjusted or whether supplemental instruction should be directed to the target student for:					
• Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
• Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
5. Develop potential reasons (hypotheses) that a student or group of students is/are not achieving desired levels of performance (i.e., benchmarks) for:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
6. Identify the most appropriate type(s) of data to use for determining reasons (hypotheses) that are likely to be contributing to the problem for:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
7. Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					

The skill to:	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
<hr/>					
8. Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for:					
a. Academic core curricula	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavioral core curricula	①	②	③	④	⑤
c. Academic supplemental curricula	①	②	③	④	⑤
d. Behavioral supplemental curricula	①	②	③	④	⑤
e. Academic individualized intervention plans	①	②	③	④	⑤
f. Behavioral individualized intervention plans	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
9. Ensure that any supplemental and/or intensive interventions are integrated with core instruction in the general education classroom:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
10. Ensure that the proposed intervention plan is supported by the data that were collected for:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
11. Provide the support necessary to ensure that the intervention is implemented appropriately for:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
12. Determine if an intervention was implemented as it was intended for:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
13. Select appropriate data (e.g., Curriculum-Based Measurement, DIBELS, FCAT, behavioral observations) to use for progress monitoring of student performance during interventions:					
a. Academics	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Behavior	①	②	③	④	⑤
<hr/>					
14. Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students:					
a. Graph target student data	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Graph benchmark data	①	②	③	④	⑤
c. Graph peer data	①	②	③	④	⑤
d. Draw an aimline	①	②	③	④	⑤
e. Draw a trendline	①	②	③	④	⑤

Problem Solving/Response to Intervention

Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised

Developed by the Florida PS/RtI Statewide Project — <http://floridarti.usf.edu>

The skill to:	NS	MnS	SS	HS	VHS
15. Make modifications to intervention plans based on student response to intervention.	①	②	③	④	⑤
16. Collect the following types of data:					
a. Curriculum-Based Measurement	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. DIBELS	①	②	③	④	⑤
c. Access data from appropriate district- or school-wide assessments	①	②	③	④	⑤
d. Standard behavioral observations	①	②	③	④	⑤
17. Use technology in the following ways:					
a. Use electronic data collection tools (e.g., PDAs)	①	②	③	④	⑤
b. Graph and display student and school data	①	②	③	④	⑤

THANK YOU!

Perceptions of RtI Skills Survey - Revised: Table 1Table 1. Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of *Perception of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*

Item #	Item Statement	Factor Loadings		
		I	II	III
4b1	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Use data to define the current level of performance of the target student for academics	.90	.02	-.12
4c1	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Determine the desired level of performance (i.e., benchmark) for academics	.90	.03	-.13
4d1	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Determine the current level of peer performance for the same skill as the target student for academics	.85	.05	-.08
13a	Select appropriate data (e.g., Curriculum-Based Measurement, DIBELS, FCAT, behavioral observations) to use for progress monitoring of student performance during interventions for academics	.81	.02	.05
3a	Use data <i>to make decisions</i> about individuals and groups of students for the core academic curriculum	.80	.01	-.01
9a	Ensure that any supplemental and/or intensive interventions are integrated with core instruction in the general education classroom for academics	.72	.17	-.01
10a	Ensure that the proposed intervention plan is supported by the data that were collected for academics	.71	.15	.08
7a	Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for academics	.70	.17	-.02
16a	Collect the following types of data: Curriculum-based measurement	.69	.00	.13
11a	Provide the support necessary to ensure that the intervention is implemented appropriately for academics	.69	.18	.02
2a	<i>Access</i> the data necessary to determine the percent of students in core instruction who are achieving benchmarks (district grade-level standards) in academics	.67	-.02	.10
16c	Collect the following types of data: Access data from appropriate district- or school-wide assessments	.66	.00	.18
5a	Develop potential reasons (hypotheses) that a student or group of students is/are not achieving desired levels of performance (i.e., benchmarks) for academics	.66	.21	.02
12a	Determine if an intervention was implemented as it was intended for academics	.66	.21	.06

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of *Perception of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*

Item #	Item Statement	Factor Loadings		
		I	II	III
4e1	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Calculate the gap between student current performance and the benchmark (district grade level standard) for academics	.65	.06	.14
8a	Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for academic core curricula	.65	.11	.14
4f1	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Use gap data to determine whether core instruction should be adjusted or whether supplemental instruction should be directed to the target student for academics	.64	.13	.11
6a	Identify the most appropriate type(s) of data to use for determining reasons (hypotheses) that are likely to be contributing to the problem for academics	.62	.21	.09
8e	Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for academic individualized intervention plans.	.62	.15	.12
16b	Collect the following types of data: DIBELS	.62	-.05	.09
4a1	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problems for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Define the referral concern in terms of a replacement behavior (i.e., what the student should be able to do) instead of a referral <i>problem</i> for academics	.60	.26	-.08
8c	Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for academic supplemental curricula	.60	.15	.15
15	Make modifications to intervention plans based on student response to intervention	.54	.22	.14
11b	Provide the support necessary to ensure that the intervention is implemented appropriately for behavior	.03	.84	-.01
7b	Identify the appropriate supplemental intervention available in my building for a student identified as at-risk for behavior	.02	.84	-.02
12b	Determine if an intervention was implemented as it was intended for behavior	.05	.80	.04
8b	Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for behavioral core curricula	-.03	.80	.12

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of *Perception of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*

Item #	Item Statement	Factor Loadings		
		I	II	III
8f	Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for behavioral individualized intervention plans	-.02	.80	.10
8d	Access resources (e.g., internet sources, professional literature) to develop evidence-based interventions for behavioral supplemental curricula	-.04	.80	.13
4b2	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Use data to define the current level of performance of the target student for behavior	.11	.79	-.09
9b	Ensure that any supplemental and/or intensive interventions are integrated with core instruction in the general education classroom for behavior	.10	.79	-.01
10b	Ensure that the proposed intervention plan is supported by the data that were collected for behavior	.10	.78	.05
13b	Select appropriate data (e.g., Curriculum-Based Measurement, DIBELS, FCAT, behavioral observations) to use for progress monitoring of student performance during interventions for behavior	.06	.76	.03
6b	Identify the most appropriate type(s) of data to use for determining reasons (hypotheses) that are likely to be contributing to the problem for behavior	.06	.75	.09
4c2	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Determine the desired level of performance (i.e., benchmark) for behavior	.18	.74	-.14
4d2	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Determine the current level of peer performance for the same skill as the target student for behavior	.20	.72	-.10
5b	Develop potential reasons (hypotheses) that a student or group of students is/are not achieving desired levels of performance (i.e., benchmarks) for behavior	.14	.72	.01
4f2	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Use gap data to determine whether core instruction should be adjusted or whether supplemental instruction should be directed to the target student for behavior	.10	.69	.12

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation of *Perception of RtI Skills Survey - Revised*

Item #	Item Statement	Factor Loadings		
		I	II	III
4e2	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Calculate the gap between student current performance and the benchmark (district grade level standard) for behavior	.08	.67	.13
4a2	Perform each of the following steps when identifying the problem for a student for whom concerns have been raised: Define the referral concern in terms of a replacement behavior (i.e., what the student should be able to do) instead of a referral <i>problem</i> for behavior	.20	.67	-.11
2b	<i>Access</i> the data necessary to determine the percent of students in core instruction who are achieving benchmarks (district grade-level standards) in behavior	-.02	.65	.10
3b	Use data <i>to make decisions</i> about individuals and groups of students for the core/building discipline plan.	.11	.64	.02
16d	Collect the following types of data: Standard behavioral observations	.17	.52	.14
14e	Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students: Draw a trendline	-.14	.14	.87
14c	Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students: Graph peer data	.12	-.02	.87
14b	Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students: Graph benchmark data	.17	-.08	.86
14d	Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students: Draw an aimline	-.12	.15	.85
14a	Construct graphs for large group, small group, and individual students: Graph target student data	.19	-.08	.84
17b	Use technology in the following ways: Graph and display student and school data	.20	.03	.65
17a	Use technology in the following ways: Use electronic data collection tools (e.g., PDAs)	.13	.15	.47

Note. Values represent standardized regression coefficients. Factor loadings > .47 are in boldface. Factor I = Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Academic Content; Factor II = Perceptions of RtI Skills Applied to Behavior Content; Factor III = Perceptions of Data Manipulation and Technology Use Skills. The three factors were significantly intercorrelated after oblique rotation ($r_s = .53-.67$). DIBELS = Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (Good & Kaminski, 2002). FCAT = Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (Florida Department of Education, 2005).