

Running Head: THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S ROLE IN

The School Psychologist's Role in Response to Intervention (RtI): Factors that influence
RtI implementation

Amanda Yenni and Amie Hartman

University of Wisconsin-River Falls

6/3/09

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if the actual implementation of Response to Intervention (RtI) was related to school psychologists' knowledge, district opportunities for RtI training within the school district, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI. The implementation and use of RtI was predicted to be dependent upon those variables. In this study, 247 school psychologists from Minnesota and Wisconsin were asked to complete a 32-item email survey pertaining to RtI. The results of the study showed that as school psychologists' knowledge of RtI increased, as district opportunities for RtI training increased, and when school psychologists' attitudes were positive, RtI was more often implemented.

The School Psychologist's Role in Response to Intervention (RtI): Factors that influence RtI implementation

The number of students evaluated and placed into special education has increased over the last two decades and most notably in specific learning disabilities (McNamara, Kathy & Hollinger, Constance, 2003). With the increase of special education placement, many problems have arisen such as “unnecessary stigmatization and separation of children from the mainstream, as well as disruption and fragmentation of school programs” (Fuchs, Fuchs, Bahr, Fernstrom, & Stecker, 1990). These concerns have led to the development of problem-solving methods, such as the practice of pre-referral interventions.

A child's eligibility to receive special education services always has been predicated on the belief that the child had received proper instruction and interventions within the general education classroom (Willis & Dumont, 2006). Often times these interventions do not occur which end up setting students up for being improperly serviced leaving their best interests at stake. The energy that it takes to evaluate a child for special education can often be greater than the time allotted for interventions within a classroom. Therefore the evaluation process can best serve the interests of students by implementing a problem-solving model within the general education setting. The rationale for using evidence-based interventions, which encompass pre-referral and interventions within the general and special education settings, increase the chances of producing positive student academic and behavior change.

Overview of Response to Intervention (RtI)

RtI, a three-tiered educational framework that provides an infrastructure to support the use of evidence-based practices, is one problem-solving model for instructing and intervening on behalf of all students to help improve their achievement (Danielson, Doolittle, & Bradley, 2007). RtI is an assessment-intervention model that allows schools to deliver sound instructional methods to students. Essentially, RtI is an objective examination of the cause-effect relationship(s) between academic or behavioral intervention and the student's response to the intervention (Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005).

When implementing Response to Intervention (RtI), general education teachers, with the help of other education professionals such as administrators, counselors, and school psychologists, will be able to accurately identify problems that students have through the primary and secondary tier interventions of an RtI program as well as assessments that are used for screening and progress monitoring so that student needs are met. The effectiveness of the RtI model has been demonstrated through research. The results of one study suggested that RtI implementation is related to a reduction in referrals to and placements in special education, increasing the percentage of children who demonstrated proficiency on state accountability tests, and a reduction in the number of children retained in a grade (Burns, Appleton & Stehouwer, 2005). RtI has also been shown to enhance student learning and improve systematic outcomes.

As IDEA regulations require continuous progress monitoring of academic performance and assessments in order for students to be considered for special education services, RtI continues to gain more popularity and support among many states in the

United States. In the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA 2004), the federal mandate states that local education agencies (LEA) “shall not be required to take into consideration whether a child has a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability” when diagnosing a learning disability (IDEA, 2004). Moreover by identifying learning problems, educators will be able to develop alternative strategies, such as RtI, to overcome these problems before they lead to further difficulties resulting in the referral to special education services.

The Role of School Psychologists in RtI

School psychologists play an important role in the implementation of RtI, particularly in being knowledgeable about RtI. Although Response to Intervention (RtI) is a relatively new concept within federal special education legislation, it is not a new concept for most school psychologists. Special education and school psychology journals have been publishing information on progress monitoring tools, such as curriculum based measurement (CBM), for over two decades (Decker, Bolt, & Triezenberg, 2006). Knowledge of RtI is essential to further understand how interventions are designed, how to monitor progress, how to problem-solve and operate consultation models.

In general, school psychologists have basic to excellent knowledge of RtI component parts (problem solving, curriculum based assessment, alternative assessment, etc.) although the RtI process may not have yet been explored in their districts. Recent and forthcoming changes in legislation, regulations, and policy are likely to allow school psychologists more opportunities to apply their training in intervention and consultation within practice settings. School psychologists may soon be able to apply an RtI framework in helping educators, parents, and students make a variety of educational

decisions (Decker, Bolt, & Triezenberg, 2006). Therefore, it is important that school psychologists receive training in district implementation of RtI and receive ample opportunities in acquiring skills related to RtI.

The role of a school psychologist can be directly and positively influenced by utilizing the RtI problem-solving model. School psychologists are important members of any RtI implementation team because they are good consumers of research and well qualified in assessment and instructional methodology (Keith, 2002). School psychologists have designated responsibilities within each tier of an RtI model which include scientifically based data decision-making, being knowledgeable about various assessment systems and appropriateness of those assessments, facilitating collaboration between the home, school, and community environments, maintaining intervention integrity and providing consultation services for administrators, teachers, and parents.

School psychologists should have a strong role in RtI because school psychologists already have a strong partnership with parents and it keeps them involved in the early stages of problem identification within their child's academic, social and emotional development. In addition to having a strong role in RtI, school psychologists can help influence staff members' attitudes of RtI by having a positive attitude themselves.

Purpose and Research Questions

The present study examined three specific research questions pertaining to the factors that influence RtI implementation with school psychologists from the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin. With these research questions, it was hypothesized that school psychologists' knowledge of RtI, school psychologists' opportunities for RtI growth

within the school district, and school psychologists' attitudes of RtI would positively correlate with RtI implementation. The following research questions that were addressed in this study included:

- a) Are there significant positive relationships (see Table 1) between school psychologists' knowledge of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI with RtI implementation?
- b) Are there positive significant relationships between each of the 18 survey items (see Table 2) for school psychologists' knowledge, district opportunities for RtI training, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI with RtI implementation?
- c) Together, how well do the school psychologist variables (knowledge of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training, and attitudes toward RtI) predict implementation of RtI?

The implementation and use of RtI was predicted to be dependent upon the advanced knowledge of the school psychologists, district opportunities, and attitudes of RtI. The school psychologist carries a vital role in the RtI process because their knowledge and attitudes of RtI reflect the amount of RtI that is used within their school district.

In addition, it is important that participants realize that their school districts play an important role in the implementation of RtI with opportunities for growth and further training of RtI. The data from the surveys, which will be discussed in the results and discussion sections of this research paper, are helpful because school districts can investigate areas that they need to address and modify in order to meet their academic goals with the use of RtI, as well as reduce the number of special education referrals.

Method

Participants

A survey was completed by 247 practicing school psychologists (55 male, 189 female, and 3 unknown) who were employed in rural, suburban and urban communities serving various schools (elementary, middle, high school) in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Out of the 247 practicing school psychologists, 113 (46.5%) worked in Minnesota, 130 (53.5%) worked in Wisconsin, and 4 school psychologists did not report. When school psychologists reported the type of school they worked in, 32 (13.2%) school psychologists reported working in urban schools, 127 (52.3%) in suburban, 84 (34.6%) in rural, and 4 did not reply. The mean number of years of experience for the school psychologists was 12.4.

Within the sample of Minnesota and Wisconsin school psychologists, 86 (35.2%) reported having a masters degree, 132 (54.1%) reported having an education specialist degree, 26 (10.7%) reported having a doctorate degree, and 3 did not reply. Out of the 247 school psychologists that reported, 58 (23.8%) served in 1 school, 98 (40.2%) in 2 schools, 49 (20.1%) in 3 schools, 19 (7.8%) in 4 schools, and 20 (8.2%) in 5 schools or more.

Survey

School psychologists were asked to complete a 32-item email survey pertaining to RtI (See Appendix A). All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale. There were three defined continuous independent variables in the research study: school psychologists' knowledge of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training within the school district, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI. Of the 32-item survey used in the

study, 24 items measured the relationship between the variables and the implementation of RtI. These data were analyzed using a multiple regression analysis and separate bivariate correlations for the 3 variables. In addition, demographic data were collected, including: school psychologists' years of experience, gender, degree, population of students that the school psychologists served, age group of students served, number of school the school psychologists served, and the type of community and state in which they were employed.

The survey items in this study were chosen to answer the questions the examiners had about factors that influence RtI implementation. The current literature currently has gaps in how RtI implementation is influenced. When researching information about school psychologists' knowledge of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training offered to school psychologists, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI, it was found that school psychologists have learned many components of RtI in their training programs and school districts. However, school psychologists need to work and collaborate with educators, students, and parents in order to implement RtI. Additional practitioner input from workshops and seminars indicated that there were many holes and gaps in the RtI implementation process and that many were uncertain whether or not RtI was an effective model.

Regarding internal reliability of the survey, the questions related to implementation of RtI showed good internal consistency ($\text{Alpha} = .778$). Two of the independent variables also had acceptable to good internal reliability: the school psychologists' attitudes of RtI ($\text{Alpha} = .759$) and the district opportunities for RtI training ($\text{Alpha} = .796$). The items on the survey pertaining to school psychologists'

knowledge of RtI had a questionable level of internal reliability ($\text{Alpha} = .527$). This low internal reliability suggested there were items on this portion of the survey that were not correlated well based on the answers provided by the school psychologists in this study. However, it was demonstrated that school psychologists' knowledge and attitudes of RtI were highly intercorrelated.

Procedure

About 550 emails were sent to school psychologists who were selected by the researchers, with 247 survey responses yielding a 44.9 percent response rate. The researchers worked to find a variety of school psychologists from urban, suburban, and rural communities in the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin to participate in the study by searching out websites of school districts and jotting down the email addresses of the listed school psychologists they were able to find. The school psychologists selected for the study were then sent emails, which were located through those district websites. The emails included the purpose of the study and instructions for completing and returning the survey which included the link to the website "Survey Monkey." Furthermore, the email included a statement ensuring confidentiality of all responses. The results from "Survey Monkey" were analyzed using SPSS for Windows.

Results

Are there significant positive relationships between school psychologists' knowledge of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI with RtI implementation?

A bivariate correlation was conducted in order to address whether or not there was any relationship between school psychologists' knowledge of RtI and the degree of

RtI implementation in the school district in which they were employed. It was found that there was a statistically significant medium positive correlation ($r=.394, p=.000$), between a school psychologist's implementation of RtI and their knowledge of RtI (see Table 1). This demonstrated that as school psychologists' self ratings of knowledge of RtI increased, the implementation of RtI also increased.

A second bivariate correlation was conducted in order to address whether or not there was any relationship between school psychologists' attitudes of RtI and the degree of RtI implementation in the school district in which they were employed. The bivariate correlation demonstrated there was a statistically significant medium positive correlation ($r=.311, p=.000$), between the school psychologists' attitudes of RtI and the degree to which RtI was used (see Table 1). This suggested that as the school psychologists' attitudes of RtI increased, the usage of RtI implementation in their school districts also increased.

Finally, a third bivariate correlation was conducted in order to address whether or not there was a positive significant relationship between school psychologists' district opportunities for RtI training and the degree of RtI implementation in the school districts in which they were employed. A bivariate correlation was conducted and indicated there was a statistically significant medium to high positive correlation ($r = .515, p = .000$) between the opportunities for growth offered to school psychologists within the school district and the degree to which RtI was used (See Table 1). This suggested that as the

Table 1

Bivariate Correlations of the 3 Variables and RtI Implementation

Variable	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Descriptive
Knowledge of RtI	.394	.000	Medium Positive
District Opportunities for RtI- Related Training	.515	.000	Medium to High Positive
Attitudes of RtI	.311	.000	Medium Positive

school psychologists received more district opportunities for RtI training, the usage of RtI also increased.

Are there positive significant relationships between each of the 18 survey items for school psychologists' knowledge, district opportunities for RtI training, and school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI with RtI implementation?

Additionally, the authors addressed whether or not there were positive significant relationships between the eighteen survey items for school psychologists' knowledge of RtI, school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI, district opportunities for RtI training, and the school psychologists implementation of RtI. Bivariate correlations were conducted. There were multiple statistically significant positive correlations between survey items within each of the three variables and implementation of RtI. More specifically, within the seven knowledge items, the question, "I have not learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at local school district in-services/workshops" had the highest statistically significant medium positive correlation with RtI implementation

Table 2

Correlations Between School Psychologists' Knowledge of RtI, School Psychologists' Attitudes of RtI, and District Opportunities for RtI Training Offered to School Psychologists With the Degree of RtI Implementation

Knowledge Survey Items	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ²
I have a good overall working knowledge of RtI.	0.303**	0.092
<i>I have not received enough education with respect to RtI in a school psychology training program.</i>	0.04	0.002
I have learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at regional, state, and national conferences/seminars.	0.086	0.007
<i>I have not learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at local school district in-services/workshops.</i>	0.376**	0.141
I have gained knowledge about RtI through self-directed review of scholarly journals or other published content (e.g. newsletters, on-line, etc.).	-0.035	0.001
I have acquired knowledge about RtI by observing other school district personnel utilizing a problem-solving model.	0.345**	0.119
My level of knowledge of RtI has increased due to the time that I have spent in RtI training.	0.277**	0.077
Attitudes of RtI Survey Items	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ²
<i>I do not feel overwhelmed about the RtI process.</i>	0.125*	0.016

I believe that RtI is effective as a problem-solving model in its ability to improve student performance in the classroom.	0.146*	0.021
I am comfortable using RtI with students and school district staff.	0.316*	0.100
I am comfortable training school personnel in how to use RtI as a problem-solving model.	0.255*	0.065
I am comfortable implementing new changes in a school district through the use of RtI.	0.256**	0.065
I believe that RtI is effective when identifying potential learning disabilities.	0.156**	0.024
<u>District Opportunities for RtI Training Survey Items</u>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ²
I have been encouraged by my school district to attend RtI training.	0.383**	0.147
My district administrators encourage me to attend RtI in-services.	0.425**	0.181
The district has provided staff with RtI resources (e.g. books, CD's, etc.).	0.477**	0.228
My superintendent encourages me to attend RtI in-services.	0.339**	0.115
My school district has received a grant for RtI related training.	0.494**	0.244

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Note: The italicized items above are phrased negatively and appear as the original survey did. The participant responses to these items were reversed when data was entered for analysis. All results are based on this reversal process.

($r = .376$, $p = .000$). It can be inferred from the results of this question that as school psychologists from this study learned about RtI through attendance at local district in-

services and workshops, they were more inclined to implement RtI. See Table 2 for other items with statistically significant findings between school psychologists' knowledge of RtI and the degree of RtI implementation.

All six attitude questions were statistically significantly correlated with RtI implementation ($p \leq .05$). "I am comfortable using RtI with students and school district staff" ($r = .316, p = .000$) had the highest correlation within the school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI variable. It can be inferred from the data that school psychologists were more likely to implement RtI if they felt comfortable using RtI with students and school district staff. See Table 2 for other items with statistically significant findings between school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI and the degree of RtI implementation.

Within the five items measuring district opportunities for RtI training offered to school psychologists, all questions demonstrated statistically significant correlations with RtI implementation ($p \leq .01$). The first item, "My school district has received a grant for RtI related training" ($r = .494, p = .000$) had the highest correlation within the school psychologists' district opportunities for RtI training variable. It can be inferred from the data that school psychologists were more likely to implement RtI if they received grants for RtI related training. See Table 2 for other items with statistically significant findings between school psychologists' district opportunities for RtI training and the degree of RtI implementation.

Overall, the survey item, "My school district has received a grant for RtI related training" had the strongest relationship with school psychologists' implementation of RtI. Furthermore, it explained 24.4% of the variance of the variable. We can infer from the data that this was the most important component in implementing RtI within schools. The

least important component in implementing RtI within the schools, as demonstrated by the data from Table 2, was the item, "I do not feel overwhelmed about the RtI process." This demonstrated that it is possible school psychologists have positive attitudes with the RtI process, although they may be unable to have a role in the implementation process within their schools.

Together, how well do the school psychologist variables (knowledge of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training, and attitudes toward RtI) predict implementation of RtI?

A multiple regression was conducted to help determine how much the independent variables together (school psychologists' attitudes of RtI, district opportunities for RtI training, and school psychologists' knowledge of RtI) contribute to the degree of implementation of RtI in the school psychologists' school districts. It was found that all three variables together correlated at a medium to high positive correlation ($R=.561$), with implementation of RtI. Together they explained 32% of the variance in RtI implementation ($R^2=.315$), $p<.001$.

The semi-partial correlations indicated the relative influence of the entered variables, once the influence of all the other individual variables was taken out. When the influence of all the other independent variables in the equation were taken out, school psychologists' knowledge of RtI explained about 1.4% of implementation (.014), school psychologists' attitude level explained about 1.6% of implementation (.016), and district opportunities explained approximately 14% of implementation (.138). In summary, knowledge of RtI, comfort level, and district opportunities for growth all collectively helped predict the amount of implementation.

Discussion

The results of the analyses showed that the implementation of RtI was influenced by school psychologists' knowledge, district opportunities for growth, and attitudes. The data demonstrate that school psychologists carry a vital role in the RtI process because their knowledge, district opportunities for RtI growth and attitudes of RtI reflect the amount of RtI that is used within their school district. It was found that all three independent variables together correlated at a medium to high positive correlation ($r=.561$), with implementation of RtI, but district level training and opportunities were clearly the primary reason why implementation occurred in this sample.

When a multiple regression was conducted with these three independent variables, together they explained 32% of RtI implementation. When considered alone without the influence of each other, the individual variable items in this study suggested a lot of variable overlap, with school psychologists' knowledge of RtI explaining 1.4% of implementation, school psychologists' attitudes toward RtI explaining 1.6% of implementation, and district opportunities of RtI offered to school psychologists explaining about 14% of RtI implementation. This demonstrated that school psychologists' knowledge and attitudes toward RtI explained a small percentage of implementation whereas district opportunities of RtI offered to school psychologists explained a larger amount of implementation. However, together the variables accounted for a great amount (32% of RtI implementation).

All three variables individually and collectively helped predict the amount of implementation. It can be concluded that district opportunities for RtI training impacted school psychologists' knowledge and attitudes toward RtI implementation. From the

results, one can infer that when a school psychologist has been given opportunities for RtI training from their district, they are likely to have more knowledge of RtI and consequently will have positive attitudes and feel comfortable with the RtI process overall.

With the bivariate correlations between the three variables and RtI implementation, district opportunities for RtI training provided to school psychologists had the strongest correlation. It can be concluded that RtI training opportunities provided to school psychologists from their school district are more likely to result in RtI implementation. The individual survey questions from each of the three variables indicated that the survey item, "My school district has received a grant for RtI related training" had the strongest relationship with the school psychologist's implementation of RtI, ($r=.494$), which suggests that the presence of funding for RtI related training is a strong indicator of the RtI process occurring to some degree in a district. This also suggests schools need clear direction from their administration if RtI is to occur. Administration support and planning for the RtI process is crucial. The RtI process requires change of an entire system. Therefore, it is necessary to have a strong team of administrators who establish RtI implementation as a goal for the school district and prioritize accordingly; providing training at the district level, encouraging psychologists to attend in-services and trainings, and allocating resources to staff in order for them to expand their knowledge and competence in the RtI process.

Additionally, the survey item, "I have not learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at local school district in-services/workshops" had a strong relationship with implementation of RtI, ($r=.376$). Compared to another survey item

within the knowledge variable, “I have learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at regional, state, and national conferences/seminars,” that did not have a strong or significant relationship with implementation, ($r=.086$), the difference demonstrates the necessary emphasis on the importance of district opportunities, more so than any regional or national training opportunities. For example, when a district sends a school psychologist to a NASP conference or state conference, the data suggests a school psychologist’s knowledge gained from their attendance will not influence the implementation of RtI as much as attending an in-service within the district.

The least important component in implementing RtI within the schools, as demonstrated by the data, was the item, “I do not feel overwhelmed about the RtI process.” This demonstrated that it is possible school psychologists are slightly overwhelmed about the RtI process, if they have a strong role in the implementation process within their schools. One can assume from the data, that it is possible many school psychologists are aware of the benefits of the process and feel comfortable with the process, although they may feel overwhelmed if taking a strong leadership role and when influencing members of school personnel in believing in the system.

The survey item, “I have not received enough education with respect to RtI in a school psychology training program” had a very small insignificant relationship with implementation of RtI, ($r=.04$). These data suggest that school psychology training programs where participants of the survey attended did not provide enough education on RtI. Knowledge obtained from training programs is important and can positively influence implementation of RtI. Therefore, training programs need to provide both educational and training opportunities to students in order for them to possess the

knowledge required to be equipped in being a leader in implementing RtI within their school districts.

General Limitations of Study

The survey items of the school psychologists' knowledge and attitudes of RtI were found to be closely related. The semi-partial correlations and multiple regressions conducted demonstrated a strong overall influence of the independent variables. Moreover, the reliability data of the survey items within the knowledge variable demonstrated a questionable level of internal consistency of the seven survey items. Due to the similarity of the survey items and influence that school psychologists' knowledge and attitudes both had on RtI implementation, the items of the survey may not have been measuring what they were intended to measure.

Items could also have been added to the survey that examined other variables related to how long it takes for districts to implement RtI, administration and teachers' perceptions and attitudes of RtI, SES of the students in the district, and the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of RtI implementation.

General Implications of Findings and Future Directions

At least one important variable has been completely ignored in current research and literature; that is, which factors have prevented school psychologists from becoming leaders in the planning of RtI implementation in their school districts. Although researchers like the study conducted by Danielson et al (2007) have identified the positive benefits of RtI as an effective problem-solving model, little is known as to what others factors, other than limited knowledge, attitudes, and district opportunities for growth, limit school psychologists' ability to implement RtI. Within the variance of the

implementation variable, 68 % has not been accounted for. Therefore, future studies should investigate more specific factors within the area of district opportunities provided to school psychologists that aid in developing solid problem-solving teams and RtI system-wide implementation models in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of RtI implementation.

One potential topic to investigate would be the roles and responsibilities that school district administrators should expect and require of school psychologists in the RtI process. Appropriate engineering in the designation of a school psychologist's role shift is necessary among school district administrators in order for school psychologists to be influential in leading the implementation of RtI. When investigating this matter in a future study, it would be beneficial to survey school administrators, such as superintendents and special education directors, to gain a clearer representation of their expectations and perceptions of the systems change and role shift of school psychologists within their districts in the influence of implementation of RtI. School districts need to be involved. Being a general education initiative, RtI needs to be supported by a collaborative team of administrators from both special and general education departments.

Furthermore, RtI has the ability to bridge the gap and develop a more cohesive community of educators. Therefore, studies should investigate the ways in which school districts can achieve RtI implementation through identifying appropriate goals needed. A nation-wide sample in future studies would increase the external validity of the study making it more viable to infer results.

In this present study, the authors analyzed the relationships between the implementation of Response to Intervention (RtI), a school psychologists' knowledge, opportunities for RtI growth within the school district, and school psychologists' attitudes of RtI. The findings of this study demonstrated that school psychologists carry a vital role in the RtI process because their knowledge, district opportunities for RtI training, and attitudes of RtI reflect the amount of RtI that is used within their school district. It was found that district opportunities for training are very important. In the future, more research needs to be conducted in order to determine if there are other factors that limit or contribute to RtI implementation in school districts. Hopefully, future research will establish a bank of knowledge for school districts nationwide to utilize an effective RtI process for the betterment of student's intellectual, social, emotional health and educational programming.

References

- Brown-Chidsey, R., & Steege, M. (2005). *Response to intervention: Principles and strategies for effective practice* (1st ed., pp. 1-176). New York: Guilford Publishers.
- Burns, M. K., Appleton, J. J., & Stehouwer, J. D. (2005). Meta-analysis of response-to-intervention research: Examining field-based and research-implemented models. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*.
- Danielson, L., Doolittle, J., & Bradley, R. (2007). Professional development, capacity building, and research needs: Critical issues for response to intervention implementation. *School Psychology Review, 36*(4), 632-637.
- Decker, D., Bolt, S., & Triezenberg, H. (2006). Reflections on internship experiences within systems that systematically assess response-to-intervention. *Communique, 35*, 34-35. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Bahr, M. W., Fernstrom, P., & Stecker, P. M. (1990). Prereferral Intervention: A Prescriptive Approach. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 493-514.
- Keith, T. Z. (2002). Commentary: Academic enablers and school learning. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 394-402.
- McNamara, K & Hollinger, C. (2003). Intervention-based assessment: Evaluation rates and eligibility findings. *Exceptional Children, 69*, 181.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *IDEA Regulations*. <http://www.ed.gov>
- Willis, J. O. & Dumont, R. (2006). And never the twain shall meet: Can response to intervention and cognitive assessment be reconciled? *Psychology in the schools, 43*, 901-908

Appendix A

Survey-The School Psychologist's Role of Response to Intervention (RtI): Factors that influence RtI implementation

We are researching the role of Response to Intervention (RtI) and school psychologists' knowledge and competencies, opportunities for growth and perceptions of the use of RtI. We ask you to participate by completing the following survey. Please do not include your name on the questionnaire; this study is meant to be anonymous. It is completely voluntary; if you are willing to participate, please answer the questions to the best of your ability.

- 1=Strongly disagree
- 2=Disagree
- 3=Neutral
- 4=Agree
- 5=Strongly agree

Please rate the following using the above rating scale.

1. I have a good overall working knowledge of RtI. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I have not received enough education with respect to RtI in a school psychology training program. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I have learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at regional, state, and national conferences/seminars. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I have not learned new knowledge about RtI through attendance at local school district in-services/workshops. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I have gained knowledge about RtI through self-directed review of scholarly journals or other published content (e.g. newsletters, on-line, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5
6. I have acquired knowledge about RtI by observing other school district personnel utilizing a problem-solving model. 1 2 3 4 5
7. My level of knowledge of RtI has increased due to the time that I have spent in RtI training. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I do not feel overwhelmed about the RtI process. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I believe that RtI is effective as a problem-solving model in its ability to improve student performance in the classroom. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I am comfortable using RtI with students and school district staff. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I am comfortable training school personnel in how to use RtI as a problem-solving model. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I am comfortable implementing new changes in a school district through the use of RtI. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I believe that RtI is effective when identifying potential learning disabilities. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I have been encouraged by my school district to attend RtI training. 1 2 3 4 5
15. My district administrators encourage me to attend RtI in-services. 1 2 3 4 5
16. The district has provided staff with RtI resources (e.g. books, CDs, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5

- 17. My superintendent encourages me to attend RtI in-services. 1 2 3 4 5
- 18. My school district has received a grant for RtI related training. 1 2 3 4 5
- 19. The implementation of RtI is a set goal for my school district. 1 2 3 4 5

Yes/No Questions

- 1. Do you have an RtI problem-solving team establish within your district? Y N
- 2. Has an RtI pilot program been established within your school district? Y N
- 3. Have district personnel been RtI trained within individual schools in your district? Y N
- 4. Is there currently an RtI data collection system in place in your school? Y N
- 5. Are there specific leaders with designated responsibilities regarding to RtI? Y N

Demographic Data

- 1. How many years have you been a school psychologist?
- 2. Gender?
- 3. Highest level of education? Masters Education Specialist Doctorate
- 4. Estimate the population of students at your school which you serve?
- 5. What is the age range of students that you serve? Birth-5 yrs, K-5th, 6th-8th, 9th-12th
- 6. How many different schools do you work at?
- 7. What type of community do you serve? Urban Suburban Rural
- 8. What state do you work in? Minnesota Wisconsin