Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI)

Description & Purpose

Theoretical Background

The Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI) is a progress monitoring tool used to assess the extent to which schools are making progress toward full implementation of PS/RtI practices. Implementation of new practices such as PS/RtI is a gradual process that occurs in stages, not a one-time event (Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005). Because many educational reform efforts fail due to lack of implementation (Sarason, 1990), it is critical that implementation integrity be examined. Several methods for examining implementation integrity exist. These methods can be divided into three categories: self-report, permanent product reviews, and observations (Noell & Gansle, 2006).

Description

The SAPSI is a self-report measure organized around the same system’s change model (consensus, infrastructure and implementation) as the NASDSE (http://www.nasdse.org) School-Based Blueprint for Implementation of RtI. Specifically, the SAPSI contains 27 items that assess the extent to which schools are (1) building consensus among key stakeholders, (2) developing the infrastructure necessary to support implementation, and (3) implementing PS/RtI practices and procedures. School-Based Leadership Teams (SBLTs) complete the items collaboratively by selecting from the following response options: N= Not Started (The activity occurs less than 25% of the time); I= In Progress (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time); A= Achieved (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time); M= Maintaining (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time). Only one response should be provided for each item.
Purpose

The purpose of the instrument is two-fold. The first purpose is to assess current levels of consensus, infrastructure development, and implementation of a PS/RtI model. This information is used to identify areas in which schools and districts require actions to be taken to facilitate PS/RtI implementation. The second purpose is to assist educators in progress monitoring implementation of the PS/RtI model. These data are used to evaluate the extent to which actions taken to facilitate implementation have been successful as well as identify any needs not identified during previous administrations.

Intended Audience

Who Should Complete the SAPSI?

School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) members complete the SAPSI. 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.

Who Should Use the Results for Decision Making?

The SBLTs who complete the SAPSI 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.

Directions for Administration

The SAPSI is completed by SBLT members in three steps.

Step 1

An identified facilitator (e.g., PS/RtI Coach, Principal) reviews the SAPSI to ensure that the format and content are understood by SBLT members. All SBLT members...
should be provided information on the SAPSI’s purpose, what the instrument measures, how the information will be used, and procedures for completing it.

**Step 2**

Each SBLT member completes the assessment individually. Facilitators can provide a copy of the SAPSI to each SBLT member prior to the scheduled SBLT meeting at which the instrument will be completed. Disseminating copies of the instrument approximately 1 week before the meeting provides adequate time for participants to record their perspectives and to attend ready to contribute to discussions.

**Step 3**

The facilitator guides discussion until consensus is reached among the group regarding the score for each item. The facilitator records final responses to be submitted. Group completion of the SAPSI typically takes 30 minutes to 2 hours depending on the amount of discussion required to reach consensus on each item. Only the SAPSI version that represents the consensus of the SBLT members should be used for decision-making purposes.

Some teams have found it helpful to identify potential action plans to address needs identified while completing the SAPSI. Although using the data derived from the SAPSI to inform implementation actions is highly recommended, facilitators will need to attend to the amount of time allocated to complete the instrument to ensure that the team completes all items.

**Frequency of Use**

When determining how often SBLT members should complete the SAPSI, 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 SAPSI 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 SAPSI are provided below. General recommendations are to administer the instrument:

- During the beginning and end of the first year of PS/RtI implementation efforts. Completing the SAPSI at the beginning of the year can assist SBLT and DBLT members in identifying initial levels of consensus, infrastructure development, and implementation of PS/RtI practices. The information obtained can be used to develop short- and long-term goals for implementing PS/RtI practices as well as develop strategic and action plans (e.g., profes-
Technical Adequacy

Content Validity Evidence

Content validity evidence was determined by careful identification and definition of the domains of specific content that the instrument would measure as reflected in the literature on systems change and from review of other instruments that purport to measure the identified domains. The Project’s version of the instrument was adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPSI v. 1.6. The Illinois ASPIRE SAPSI included items that assessed indicators of consensus development, infrastructure building, and implementation of PS/RtI practices. Because the sections included matched the systems change model adopted by the Project, Project staff decided to make modifications to some items to align with specifics of the PS/RtI model used in the State of Florida.

Internal Consistency Reliability

Internal consistency reliability estimates were computed for each of the three domains measured by the instrument. Specifically, items within each of the three SAPSI sections of “Consensus,” “Infrastructure Development,” and “Implementation” were examined separately. SAPSIs administered during the Winter of 2010 to 34 pilot schools were used to derive internal consistency estimates. The following Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were derived for each of the three domains:

- Consensus: $\alpha = .64$
- Infrastructure Development: $\alpha = .89$
- Implementation: $\alpha = .91$.

Scoring

Analysis of Responses to the SAPSI

The amount of analysis required to use the SAPSI for decision-making will likely depend on the unit of analysis (e.g., school, district, state). School-level personnel using the results may want to simply chart responses from the final version(s) com-
pleted by the facilitator to identify needs and monitor progress over time. Stakeholders examining other units of analysis (e.g., district-level, schools served across a state or geographic region) would likely need to aggregate results to inform decision-making. Included below are ways in which personnel aggregating results from multiple schools can consider analyzing data from the SAPSI.

The Florida PS/RtI Project has primarily utilized two techniques for analyzing data for formative evaluation purposes. First, the mean rating for each item can be calculated to determine the average activity level evident across change domains. Second, the frequency of (i.e., frequency distribution) each response option selected (i.e., Not Started, In Progress, Achieved, Maintaining) by SBLTs can be calculated for each item.

Calculating item means provides an overall impression of the consensus, infrastructure development, and implementation activities occurring. When calculating average implementation levels, the following values should correspond with each response option: 0 = Not Started; 1 = In Progress; 2 = Achieved; 3 = Maintaining. Calculating average activity levels can be done at the domain and/or individual item levels. Examining implementation at the domain level allows educators to examine general patterns in (1) consensus building, (2) infrastructure development, and (3) implementation. A domain score for each of the three change domains measured by the instrument may be computed for SAPSIs completed 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 total number of items within the domain to produce an average activity level for each domain. The items that comprise the three domains are as follows:

- **Domain 1 (Consensus):** Items 1-5
- **Domain 2 (Infrastructure Development):** Items 6-20
- **Domain 3 (Implementation):** Items 21a-27

Average activity levels also can be examined by item. Calculating the mean rating for each item within a domain allows educators to identify the extent to which educators are engaging in specific activities to facilitate PS/RtI implementation. This information can be used to identify specific activities that may need to be addressed systematically (through professional development, policies and procedures, etc.), but does not provide detailed information regarding the variability across schools for each activity.

Calculating the frequency of schools in which activities were reported as Not Started, In Progress, Achieved, and Maintaining for an item, on the other hand, provides information on the range of activity levels. This information can be used to determine what percentage of schools engaged in specific activities to facilitate PS/RtI implementation. When making decisions about how to address implementation efforts, information on the number of schools engaging in a particular activity can help inform decisions regarding modifying implementation plans (e.g., professional development, policy/procedure development, personnel allocation). For example, identifying the percentage of schools served who have reported achieving

For example, if a school selected I, I, N, A, I when completing Items 1-5 that comprise the “Consensus” section, the values corresponding with those responses would be added together to obtain a total value of 5 (i.e., 1+1+0+2+1 = 5). The total value of 5 would be divided by the number of items (5) to obtain the domain score (i.e., 5/5 = 1). A domain score of 1 could be interpreted as the school, on average, being in progress with consensus building.
or maintaining an activity can inform whether actions should be taken to address implementation across schools or with a small number of specific schools who have not yet engaged in the activity consistently. Items on which the majority of schools report achieving or maintaining an activity would likely suggest the need to target those schools not yet consistently engaging in the activity for additional assistance. Items on which less than the majority of schools report consistent engagement in the activity would likely suggest the need to take a broader approach to impact all schools.

It is recommended that key stakeholders analyze SAPI data in ways that best inform the evaluation questions they are asking. The data collected from the instrument can be used to answer a number of broad and specific questions regarding the extent to which SBLTs report engaging in activities to implement PS/RtI. 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 consensus development across time may best be answered by calculating and displaying domain scores. Questions about specific consensus building activities occurring across a district may best be answered by calculating and displaying the number of schools that report achieving or maintaining the activities. 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**

*Training Recommended for Individuals Facilitating SAPI Completion*

Qualifications of the facilitator. Personnel in charge of facilitating completion of the SAPI should have a thorough understanding of the PS/RtI model and the systems issues that must be addressed when implementing the model. Facilitators also should possess the consultation skills required to facilitate consensus among a group of individuals that may have different opinions regarding the extent to which the school is engaging in certain activities. If individuals with expertise in the aforementioned areas are not available, facilitators should receive thorough training to develop those skill sets in addition to being trained to facilitate completion of the SAPI.
Content of the training. A brief training on facilitating completion of the **SAPSI** is recommended before administering the instrument. Trainings on facilitating completion of the **SAPSI** should include the following components:

- Theoretical background on the relationship between implementation integrity and desired outcomes, and the alignment between the **SAPSI** and a systems change approach to implementing PS/RtI practices
- Each item should be reviewed so that facilitators have a clear understanding of what is being measured. The *Item Scoring Description* (located in **SAPSI** — *Supplements*, page 26) is a useful tool for providing facilitators with guidance on how to score each item
- Administration procedures developed and/or adopted
- Common issues that arise during administration such as frequently asked questions and how to address disagreements among team members.

**Training Suggested for Analyzing, Interpreting, and Disseminating SAPSI 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 **SAPSI** 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 instrument given its purpose and technical adequacy
- Guidelines for analyzing and displaying data derived from the survey
- Guidelines for interpreting and disseminating the results

**Interpretation and Use of the Data**

Consistent with scoring the instrument, the interpretation and use of **SAPSI** data will vary by the unit of analysis being examined. Key stakeholders examining **SAPSI** data from multiple schools (e.g., district personnel examining district-level data) will likely be interpreting aggregated data. School-level personnel will likely be examining data specific to their school. Included below are recommendations for examining, interpreting, and using data to inform decisions for stakeholders examining multiple schools. School-level personnel should consider following the broad recommendations included below but will not need to conduct the steps described for examining data from multiple schools.

**Examination of Broad Domains**

When interpreting **SAPSI** data, it is recommended that the three broad domains measured by the instrument (i.e., Consensus, Infrastructure Development, Implementation) be examined first. Key stakeholders (e.g., SBLTs, DBLTs) can examine graphically displayed data to evaluate levels of consensus, infrastructure development, and implementation. Each of the methodologies for scoring mentioned
above (i.e., calculating average activity levels at the domain and item levels and calculating the frequency/percent of schools 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 from the SAPSI is to take note of the percent of schools that reported having Not Started (0), being In Progress (1), having Achieved (2), and having Maintained activities to facilitate PS/RtI implementation (see Year 2 Evaluation Report, page 43). This type of visual analysis allows stakeholders to determine the extent to which schools tend to report engaging in a given activity. This approach can be used to examine activities designed to facilitate implementation for any given administration as well as to examine trends over time.

Identification of Specific Needs

Each item within the domains also can be graphed to examine trends in which activities tend to be engaged in more or less frequently. Key stakeholders should consider a number of factors when identifying which activities tend to be engaged in at relatively high levels versus those being engaged in at low levels. The extent to which schools should be facilitating consensus, developing infrastructure, and implementing PS/RtI practices will depend on training received; length of time since the school decided to implement the model; district, state, and national policies and procedures; availability of data systems to support data-based decision-making; among myriad other factors. Given the multiple interacting variables that impact school efforts to implement any initiative, it is important to consider all aspects of the system that contribute to or impede engagement in specific activities while developing plans that address needs evident in the data.

Although using self-report measures such as the SAPSI can provide invaluable information on the extent to which SBLTs report engaging in activities to facilitate PS/RtI implementation, self-report data tends to be positively biased (Noell & Gansle, 2006). Given the potential for schools to report higher levels of activities than what other sources of data would suggest, it is recommended that data from the SAPSI be compared with other data/information on implementation integrity.

Data Dissemination to Stakeholders

It is important that a plan for disseminating data on implementation integrity and providing key stakeholders the time and support to discuss the information be included in a plan to scale-up PS/RtI practices. It is recommended that these key stakeholders be identified and data be shared with them as quickly and frequently as possible following time periods when the SAPSI tends to be completed. This time line allows stakeholders such as SBLT members to discuss activity levels suggested from the SAPSI data, develop or alter goals, and design strategies (e.g., professional development plan, access technology resources, develop procedures) to facilitate increased levels of implementation. DBLT members may also want access to data from schools to plan support provided at the district level. Additionally, SBLT and DBLT members may find it helpful to have a coach or facilitator discuss the data with members participating in meetings to facilitate interpretation.
and problem-solve barriers to implementation efforts. Finally, SBLT members are highly encouraged to share school SAPSI data with instructional staff members. The stakeholders are often critical to the implementation of a PS/RtI model and their support and input are important to consider when developing and finalizing action plans.

To facilitate discussions about implementation efforts, one helpful strategy is to provide educators with guiding questions. The use of guiding questions is designed to facilitate discussions about each school’s data, including potential strategies for increasing the use of PS/RtI practices. Listed below are examples of guiding questions used by the Florida PS/RtI Project to facilitate discussions regarding implementation integrity. These guiding questions were designed to facilitate discussions about each school’s data, including current level of problem-solving implementation and consistency between SAPSI data and other implementation integrity measures (e.g., other data sources are discussed elsewhere in this manual) (see also Year 2 Evaluation Report). However, stakeholders can generate additional guiding questions to better meet the needs of their school.

- What are the patterns?
  - What patterns are evident among each of the individual items on the checklist and across all data sources?
  - What steps of the problem-solving process are occurring more frequently? Less frequently?
  - Are there any current indicators that show a zero or low level of implementation? Why?
    - Have these been targeted in the past?
    - Do barriers exist with consensus or infrastructure?
    - Other priorities?
    - Meetings not happening or focusing on implementation?
- How have you progressed in implementing the Problem-Solving Model with fidelity?
  - Looking across all fidelity measures (CCC, SAPSI, and Observations), what are the general levels of implementation? What are the general trends?
  - Do the data from the Critical Component Checklist and Observations support what is evident in the SAPSI items 22a-22i?
    - Are there discrepancies among the different sources of data with using the Problem-Solving model?
    - How might these discrepancies be interpreted?

School-Level Example of SAPSI Data

The following example demonstrates how key stakeholders may use data derived from the SAPSI to inform PS/RtI implementation. Data from the SAPSI 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,
Figure 3. School-Level Example of SAPSI Data (BOY = Beginning of Year; EOY = End of Year).
the concepts discussed can be generalized to other units of analysis (e.g., district-level, state-level).

**Background Information and Explanation of the Graph**

Sunshine Elementary recently committed to implementing the PS/RtI model at the school. The newly formed SBLT at Sunshine Elementary met at the beginning of the school year to plan for implementation but realized that they did not know where to begin. At the suggestion of the school’s PS/RtI Coach, the team decided to complete the SAPI at their next meeting to inform goals and activities for the year and beyond. They also agreed to complete the instrument again at the end of the year to examine progress and identify additional needs. Given that the school was in the beginning stages of implementing PS/RtI practices, the team decided to focus first on consensus development. Figure 3 above includes results of the items from the SAPI that assess consensus activities. Notice that two bars are located above each item. For each item, these bars represent the two time points in which the SBLT completed the SAPI during the first year. The blue bars represent initial, beginning of the year (BOY) SAPI scores for Sunshine Elementary, while the red bars represent the end of year (EOY) SAPI scores. For each item, the following scale was used: 0 = Not Started, 1 = In Progress, 2 = Achieved, 3 = Maintaining.

**Interpretation and Use of the Data**

**Examination of broad SAPI domains.** Following the first administration of the SAPI at the beginning of the year, the SBLT met to discuss the results and plan for addressing consensus levels. First, the SBLT took note of the initial status of consensus building activities reflected by the SAPI items displayed in Figure 3. Team members noted that district commitment (Item 1), SBLT support (Item 2), and having an established SBLT (Item 4) were all in progress as indicated by the values of one displayed on the graph. They also noted that the school had not started involving the faculty (Item 3) or using data to assess staff levels of commitment (Item 5) as noted by the value of zero displayed on the graph. Overall, these data suggested that work needed to be done to establish consensus for PS/RtI implementation at the school before school-wide implementation could occur. SBLT members proceeded to plan for how to increase consensus at the school.

**Identification of specific needs.** Because the SBLT noted that the school had not started or was in progress with consensus building activities at the beginning of the school year, certain activities could be recommended. For example, to increase district commitment (Item 1), SBLT members could attempt to meet with district leadership staff to discuss issues, advocate for further PS/RtI-related professional development activities, and foster regular communication with the DBLT. Additionally, the SBLT could increase faculty involvement (Item 3) by creating opportunities to share PS/RtI updates and information with school staff, as well as encourage the input and participation of staff through a variety of strategies (e.g., discussions at staff meetings, focus groups composed of representatives from grade level teams). The SBLT also could begin to identify or create data collection tools to help assess consensus among the staff (Item 5). The decision made by the SBLT...
would depend on a number of factors including receptiveness of district leadership to providing support, whether roles and responsibilities of SBLT members have been firmly established, and what information is currently available on facilitators and barriers to staff buy-in at the school.

After some discussion, the SBLT decided that firmly establishing members of the SBLT (including roles and responsibilities) should be the primary focus of the team, at least initially. Although the SBLT had been established, questions remained about whether any additional members needed to be added and what the individual responsibilities of team members would be. Existing team members established regular biweekly meetings for the remainder of the school year at which the first task would be to finalize membership including roles and responsibilities. The team decided to focus on clearly establishing and defining the role of SBLT members as a priority because they believed that focusing on the other consensus building activities required a functioning team first. After issues with the team were addressed, SBLT members could move onto other consensus building activities that would require coordinated, systematic efforts.

Monitoring of implementation using SAPSI data over time. After finalizing team membership, and roles and responsibilities, as well as engaging in some additional consensus-building activities that were derived from SBLT planning efforts, Sunshine Elementary was interested in how their school’s consensus levels changed throughout the year. Refer back to Figure 3 above to see the end of the year SAPSI results. The red bars, representing the end of year SAPSI data, demonstrated increases in indicators of consensus development for most items. Specifically, the school had achieved the establishment of a functioning SBLT. The team also discussed the fact that the establishment of the team allowed them to engage in additional activities throughout the year to build consensus. For example, while the SBLT noted that involving faculty in PS/RtI implementation (Item 3) was not present at the beginning of the year, involving staff in implementation was in progress by the end of the school year. By administering the Beliefs Survey to school staff, Sunshine Elementary had achieved a data source to inform consensus development (Item 5) as well as provided a mechanism for involving staff. While this comparison of beginning of year to end of year data shows promising changes for Sunshine Elementary, it is critical to remember that consensus building is an ongoing activity. During Year 1, Sunshine Elementary established an SBLT that met regularly and provided increased levels of support to the school. In addition, the SBLT began collecting data to inform what supports staff needed. SBLT members agreed that it was critical to continue to engage in these activities to ensure that buy-in from key stakeholders (e.g., district leadership, school staff) continues to increase.
Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI) — Supplements

SAPSI Item Scoring Description

The item scoring descriptions below were developed to help Project PS/RtI Coaches facilitate completion of the SAPSI in Florida schools. These descriptions may be modified to be consistent with language, terms, etc. used in other areas of the nation.

Consensus: Comprehensive Commitment and Support

1. **District level leadership provides active commitment and support (e.g., meets to review data and issues at least twice each year):** SBLT members should discuss the extent to which district level leadership is helping facilitate school-level commitment to PS/RtI. The types of district level leadership activities that are currently occurring should be discussed and compared to activities that would indicate that the district level leadership is engaging schools to facilitate commitment and support. Examples of indicators include meeting with SBLT members (e.g., the team, principals) to discuss issues, providing resources such as funding and professional development opportunities, and communicating with schools on a regular basis regarding district initiatives and directions regarding PS/RtI. Importantly, these examples are not exhaustive but should be thought of as common indicators of district commitment and support.

2. **The school leadership provides training, support and active involvement (e.g., principal is actively involved in School-Based Leadership Team meetings):** Stakeholders at the school identified as individuals responsible for facilitating PS/RtI implementation should be discussed in terms of how much training, support, and involvement related to PS/RtI they are providing. Examples of indicators of leadership involvement include the principal participating in SBLT meetings, principals and/or other school leadership engaging in activities such as presenting to staff and participating in book studies on PS/RtI, and leadership freeing up time for key staff to engage in professional development and implementation activities. Again, these indicators should not be thought of as an exhaustive list.

3. **Faculty/staff support and are actively involved with problem solving/RtI (e.g., one of top 3 goals of the School Improvement Plan, 80% of faculty document support, 3-year time line for implementation available):** This item assesses the extent to which staff are involved in PS/RtI at the school. A number of examples are included in the item to reference. The key issue to discuss is how much staff members receive communications regarding PS/RtI and are provided opportunities to provide input and participate in decision-making.

4. **A School-Based Leadership Team is established and represents the roles of an administrator, facilitator, data mentor, content specialist, parent, and teachers from representative areas (e.g., general ed., special ed.):** Although direct representation of each of these roles by an individual is one way to discuss this item, it is not necessary to have one person for each role. Common examples of roles that may be represented...
by individuals indirectly include parents and sometimes teachers (although including teachers and parents directly is highly recommended). The key discussion to have with the team in these cases is the extent to which someone with experience working as or with the role advocates from their perspectives. Regardless of whether the roles are directly or indirectly represented on the team, all roles must be represented for SBLTs to provide a rating of achieved or maintained.

5. **Data are collected (e.g., beliefs survey, satisfaction survey) to assess level of commitment and impact of PS/RtI on faculty/staff:** Teams should discuss the extent to which data (e.g., surveys) are collected and used to examine how much buy-in and what needs exist among school staff. The data collected can come from Project or school developed instruments. Regardless of the source of the data, teams should ensure that data have been collected for the purpose of assessing consensus issues prior to providing a rating of achieved or maintained.

**Infrastructure Development: Data Collection and Team Structure**

6. **School-wide data (e.g., FAIR, DIBELS, Curriculum-Based Measures, Office Discipline Referrals) are collected through an efficient and effective systematic process:** School teams should discuss the extent to which data that can be used for universal screening and to summarize school outcomes are collected. How systematically and efficiently the data are collected (e.g., are the data collected every time within the suggested time frame) should be discussed as well. Data that can be collected and analyzed for the purposes of school-wide decisions must be collected a minimum of 3 times per year for teams to provide a rating of achieved or maintained.

7. **Statewide and other databases (e.g., Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network [PMRN], School-Wide Information System [SWIS]) are used to make data-based decisions:** Databases provided by the state (e.g., PMRN), the district, or purchased/developed by the school all can be used as indicators for this item. The extent to which they are actually used to help make data-based decisions, not just used to store data should be part of the discussion. Both the availability and use of the database must be present for teams to rate this item as achieved or maintained.

8. **School-wide data are presented to staff after each benchmarking session (e.g., staff meetings, team meetings, grade-level meetings):** The extent to which data summarizing student academic and behavioral outcomes at the school, grade, and classroom levels are presented to staff should be discussed. Data aggregated at the grade level can be used as an indicator for this item but school-level aggregation of data should be discussed before deciding on a rating for the item. The critical issue for teams to agree on is how frequently the performance of students in a given content area is summarized and presented staff following a benchmarking/screening session.

9. **School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic programs:** The difference between this item and the previous one is whether discussions occur that
lead to a decision regarding the effectiveness of academic content area instruction. Thus, the data examined must actually be used (can be in conjunction with other data sources) to make a decision about the extent to which core instruction met the needs of all students for a team to rate this item as achieved or maintained.

10. **School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs:**
   The discussion and decisions regarding rating this item should be the same as #9. The only difference is that the focus should be on behavior rather than academic content areas.

11. **Curriculum-Based Measurement (e.g., FAIR, DIBELS) data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for academics:**
    This item assesses the extent to which universal screening data (i.e., data collected on all students) are used to identify students in need of additional intervention to be successful in a given academic content area. Assessments such as those from the FAIR system, DIBELS, Benchmark assessments from the curriculum, etc. can be counted as long as they are administered to all students and criteria exist that allow educators to determine which students are at-risk for not meeting standards in the content area being examined. Teams should be sure to discuss how frequently the data collected are actually used to identify students at-risk before selecting a rating.

12. **Office Disciplinary Referral data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for behavior:**
    The discussion for this item should be similar to the discussion regarding #11. Although screening data and procedures may be different for behavior than academics (e.g., ODRs, teacher nomination processes), the rating decided upon by the team should be based on how systematically procedures are used to screen for students who are at-risk behaviorally.

13. **Data are used to evaluate the effectiveness (RtI) of Tier 2 intervention programs:**
    Teams should discuss how frequently data are used to evaluate how effective Tier 2 intervention protocols/programs are in terms of improving student academic and/or behavioral performance. Importantly, a part of the discussion should be the degree to which schools evaluate individual student responses versus aggregating the responses of students who were receiving the same intervention to determine how effective the protocol/program was. Teams should not rate the activity as achieved or maintained if they do not look at the effectiveness of the program in addition to looking at how individual students receiving Tier II interventions respond.

14. **Individual student data are utilized to determine response to Tier 3 interventions:**
    This item assesses the extent to which ongoing progress monitoring data are used in decisions regarding student response to intervention. More frequent progress monitoring data than what is collected through universal screenings must be frequently included in decision-making for teams to rate this activity as achieved or maintained.
15. Special Education Eligibility determination is made using the RtI model for the following ESE programs:

a. Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (EBD): Although the State of Florida requires the use of a RtI model in determining eligibility for EBD programs, a team should discuss the extent to which its school actually uses a RtI model in its decisions regarding EBD eligibility when rating this item.

b. Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD): Although the State of Florida requires the use of a RtI model in determining eligibility for SLD programs, a team should discuss the extent to which its school actually uses a RtI model in its decisions regarding SLD eligibility when rating this activity.

16. The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices.

a. Tier 1: The team should discuss how it determines if its core instructional practices are evidence-based in academic and behavioral content areas. State, district, and school policies, plans, and procedures all can be used as indicators when addressing this item.

b. Tier 2: The same discussion should occur for supplemental practices as is referenced above for core instruction.

c. Tier 3: The same discussion should occur for intensive, individualized interventions as is referenced above for core and supplemental instructional practices.

17. The School-Based Leadership Team has a regular meeting schedule for problem-solving activities: The team should discuss whether they have structured, protected meeting times to plan for and engage in problem solving. To rate this activity as achieved or maintained, teams must have meetings that are scheduled in advance and that occur multiple times throughout the school year.

18. The School-Based Leadership Team evaluates target student’s/students’ RtI at regular meetings: How often student data are used to evaluate student RtI across tiers should be discussed. The frequency at which teams meet to discuss student RtI and how much data are actually used in the decisions that are made should be factored into the rating of this activity.

19. The School-Based Leadership Team involves parents: There are multiple ways that parents can be involved in PS/RtI planning and practices. Examples include having parents on the team, communicating to and receiving input from parent organizations (e.g., PTAs), and including a representative on the team whose job it is to advocate for parents. The rating of the item should be decided based on the extent to which the team has evidence that suggests parents are meaningfully involved in School-Based Leadership Team activities.

20. The School-Based Leadership Team has regularly scheduled data day meetings.
to evaluate Tier 1 and Tier 2 data: The extent to which regularly scheduled meetings occur in which data are actually used to evaluate the impact of core (Tier 1) and supplemental (Tier 2) instructional practices should be used to rate this activity. The regularity with which these meetings are scheduled and actually occur as well as how frequently data are used (in conjunction with other sources) to inform effectiveness decisions should be included in the team’s discussion. Multiple (i.e., more than once) meetings in which data must occur for the team to rate this item as achieved or maintained.

Implementation: Three-Tiered Intervention System and Problem Solving Process

21. The school has established a three-tiered system of service delivery.
   a. Tier 1 Academic Core Instruction clearly identified: The key question to be addressed is does the school have or are they working on ways to communicate what constitutes Tier I Academic Instruction in the building. School, district, and state plans and other documents can be used to provide evidence when rating this item.
   b. Tier 1 Behavioral Core Instruction clearly identified: The rating of this item focusing on Tier I Behavior should be based on a similar discussion as is described above for 21a.
   c. Tier 2 Academic Supplemental Instruction/Programs clearly identified: The rating of this item focusing on Tier II Academic instruction should be based on a similar discussion as is described above for 21a.
   d. Tier 2 Behavioral Supplemental Instruction/Programs clearly identified: The rating of this item focusing on Tier II Behavior instruction should be based on a similar discussion as is described above for 21a.
   e. Tier 3 Academic Intensive Strategies/Programs are evidence-based: The team should discuss whether individualized, intensive academic interventions used at the school can be identified as evidence-based. Documents such as those referenced in 21a or other sources can be used as indicators for this item.
   f. Tier 3 Behavioral Intensive Strategies/Programs are evidence-based: The team should discuss whether individualized, intensive behavior interventions used at the school can be identified as evidence-based. Documents such as those referenced in 21a or other sources can be used as indicators for this item.

22. Teams (e.g., School-Based Leadership Team, Problem-Solving Team, Intervention Assistance Team) implement effective problem solving procedures including:
   a. Problem is defined as a data-based discrepancy (GAP Analysis) between what is expected and what is occurring (includes peer and benchmark data): The team should discuss the extent to which data are used to determine the performance gap between the target student(s), and (1) benchmarks/standards (i.e., expected level)
b. **Replacement behaviors (e.g., reading performance targets, homework completion targets) are clearly defined:** The extent to which the team concretely and measurably defines the skill, strategy, or concept the target student(s) are expected to demonstrate should be discussed. How frequently the team specifies the target skill/behavior so that everyone understands and agrees on the instructional target should be factored into the rating of this item.

c. **Problem analysis is conducted using available data and evidence-based hypotheses:** The extent to which the team (1) generates hypotheses based on alterable variables and (2) uses available data to determine if the reasons generated are likely barriers to the target skill/behavior being performed should be discussed. Ratings of achieved or maintained require that both components of problem analysis (i.e., generating potential reasons for student struggles and using data to determine which reasons are the most likely) are completed the majority of the time.

d. **Intervention plans include evidence-based (e.g., research-based, data-based) strategies:** Ratings on this item should be based on the extent to which the team develops instructional/intervention plans based on (1) strategies that have been demonstrated as effective through research or (2) strategies that have locally collected data to support the impact of their use.

e. **Intervention support personnel are identified and scheduled for all interventions:** Teams should discuss the extent to which support plans are developed to assist educators responsible for delivering interventions to students. To receive a rating of achieved or maintained, support plans should be developed the majority of the time that include who is responsible, what supports they will provide to the educator(s) delivering the intervention, and when and where the support will be provided.

f. **Intervention integrity is documented:** This item assesses the extent to which evidence that the intervention plan was implemented as intended is documented. Teams should examine how frequently documentation of instructional/intervention fidelity is presented when examining student RtI before rating themselves on this item.

g. **Response to intervention is evaluated through systematic data collection:** Teams should discuss how frequently benchmark and/or ongoing progress monitoring data are used to determine how students responded to instruction/intervention. To receive ratings of achieved or maintained on this item, data reflecting student performance
on the identified skill/behavior should be presented and decisions made regarding student RtI (e.g., good, questionable, poor) at the majority of meetings intended to discuss student progress.

h. **Changes are made to intervention based on student response:** The extent to which student RtI is used to adjust instruction/intervention plans should be discussed when completing this item. How frequently decisions regarding student RtI (e.g., good, questionable, poor) are directly linked to changes made (if any) in the plan for target students must be discussed prior to providing a rating.

i. **Parents are routinely involved in implementation of interventions:** How frequently parents are meaningfully involved in the intervention plans developed for students should be discussed. Involvement can take many forms (e.g., implementing a component of the plan, being involved in the meetings where the plan is developed, receiving frequent updates on student progress). Although taking part in the actual implementation of an intervention is one way a parent can be involved, teams should not consider it the only way that parents can be involved and still receive ratings of achieved or maintained for this item. What is important for teams to discuss is the extent to which parents are provided the opportunity to participate in the problem-solving process for their children.

Implementation: Monitoring and Action Planning

23. **A strategic plan (implementation plan) exists and is used by the School-Based Leadership Team to guide implementation of PS/RtI:** Teams should discuss whether they have a written down, agreed upon plan for how PS/RtI will be implemented in their schools. In addition to whether the plan exists, how comprehensive (e.g., how far down the road does the plan cover; what consensus, infrastructure, and implementation issues are addressed) the plan is should be discussed. To provide a rating of achieved or maintained for this item, a multi-year plan that addresses consensus, infrastructure, and implementation issues must be present.

24. **The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year to review data and implementation issues:** Teams should discuss how often they meet and review student and implementation data to address issues. To provide ratings of achieved or maintained, teams must meet a minimum of two times per year during which they examine and discuss student outcome and PS/RtI implementation data.

25. **The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year with the District Leadership Team to review data and implementation issues:** Teams should discuss how often they meet with members of their District Leadership Team (the full team is not required) to discuss the types of issues captured in the previous item. A minimum of 2 times per year is required to provide a rating of achieved or maintained.

26. **Changes are made to the implementation plan as a result of school and district leadership team data-based decisions:** The difference between this item and the
previous two is whether the discussions regarding student and implementation data among School- and District- Based Leadership Teams resulted in changes to the implementation plan at the school. The frequency that data are used to make changes to the plan at these meetings should be considered before providing a rating.

27. Feedback on the outcomes of the PS/RtI Project is provided to school-based faculty and staff at least yearly: The extent to which data (e.g., student outcomes, implementation data) are shared with faculty and staff at the school should be discussed by the team. How the outcomes are shared (e.g., presentation, newsletter) is not as important as what is shared and the frequency that the information is provided when discussing this item. A minimum of 1 time per year must be established for teams to rate this item as achieved or maintained.
Blank Copy of SAPSI

Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)*

**PS/RtI Implementation Assessment**

**Directions:**
In responding to each item below, please use the following response scale:

**Not Started (N)** — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
**In Progress (I)** — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
**Achieved (A)** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
**Maintaining (M)** — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

For each item below, please write the letter of the option (N, I, A, M) that best represents your School-Based Leadership Team’s response in the column labeled “Status”. In the column labeled “Comments/Evidence”, please write any comments, explanations and/or evidence that are relevant to your team’s response. When completing the items on the SAPSI, the team should base its responses on the grade levels being targeted for implementation by the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus: Comprehensive Commitment and Support</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. District level leadership provides active commitment and support (e.g., meets to review data and issues at least twice each year).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school leadership provides training, support and active involvement (e.g., principal is actively involved in School-Based Leadership Team meetings).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty/staff support and are actively involved with problem solving/RtI (e.g., one of top 3 goals of the School Improvement Plan, 80% of faculty document support, 3-year timeline for implementation available).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A School-Based Leadership Team is established and represents the roles of an administrator, facilitator, data mentor, content specialist, parent, and teachers from representative areas (e.g., general ed., special ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data are collected (e.g., beliefs survey, satisfaction survey) to assess level of commitment and impact of PS/RtI on faculty/staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments/Evidence:**

* Adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPSI v. 1.6
  Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training (CSEIT)
  Loyola University Chicago
### PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont’d)

**Scale:**
- **Not Started (N)** — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
- **In Progress (I)** — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
- **Achieved (A)** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
- **Maintaining (M)** — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

**Infrastructure Development: Data Collection and Team Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>School-wide data (e.g., DIBELS, Curriculum-Based Measures, Office Discipline Referrals) are collected through an efficient and effective systematic process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Statewide and other databases (e.g., Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network [PMRN], School-Wide Information System [SWIS]) are used to make data-based decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>School-wide data are presented to staff after each benchmarking session (e.g., staff meetings, team meetings, grade-level meetings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core academic programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>School-wide data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of core behavior programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Curriculum-Based Measurement (e.g., DIBELS) data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Office Disciplinary Referral data are used in conjunction with other data sources to identify students needing targeted group interventions and individualized interventions for behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Data are used to evaluate the effectiveness (RtI) of Tier 2 intervention programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Individual student data are utilized to determine response to Tier 3 interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Special Education Eligibility determination is made using the RtI model for the following USE programs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (EBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPSI v. 1.6 Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training (CSEIT) Loyola University Chicago
**PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont’d)**

**Scale:**
- **Not Started (N)** — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
- **In Progress (P)** — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
- **Achieved (A)** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
- **Maintaining (M)** — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Infrastructure Development: Data Collection and Team Structure (Cont’d)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments/Evidence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The school staff has a process to select evidence-based practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The School-Based Leadership Team has a regular meeting schedule for problem-solving activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The School-Based Leadership Team evaluates target student’s/students’ RtI at regular meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The School-Based Leadership Team involves parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The School-Based Leadership Team has regularly scheduled data day meetings to evaluate Tier 1 and Tier 2 data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments/Evidence:**

---
---
---

* Adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPS v. 1.6
  Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training (CSEIT)
  Loyola University Chicago
# PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont’d)

**Scale:**
- Not Started (N) — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
- In Progress (I) — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
- Achieved (A) — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
- Maintaining (M) — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

## Implementation: Three-Tiered Intervention System and Problem-Solving Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The school has established a three-tiered system of service delivery.

   a. Tier 1 Academic Core Instruction clearly identified.
   
   b. Tier 1 Behavioral Core Instruction clearly identified.
   
   c. Tier 2 Academic Supplemental Instruction/Programs clearly identified.
   
   d. Tier 2 Behavioral Supplemental Instruction/Programs clearly identified.
   
   e. Tier 3 Academic Intensive Strategies/Programs are evidence-based.
   
   f. Tier 3 Behavioral Intensive Strategies/Programs are evidence-based.

22. Teams (e.g., School-Based Leadership Team, Problem-Solving Team, Intervention Assistance Team) implement effective problem solving procedures including:

   a. Problem is defined as a data-based discrepancy (GAP Analysis) between what is expected and what is occurring (includes peer and benchmark data).
   
   b. Replacement behaviors (e.g., reading performance targets, homework completion targets) are clearly defined.

   c. Problem analysis is conducted using available data and evidence-based hypotheses.

   d. Intervention plans include evidence-based (e.g., research-based, data-based) strategies.

   e. Intervention support personnel are identified and scheduled for all interventions.

---

* Adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPSI v. 1.6

Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training (CSEIT)
Loyola University Chicago
**Self-Assessment of Problem-Solving Implementation (SAPSI) — Supplements**

---

**PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont’d)**

**Scale:**
- **Not Started (N)** — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
- **In Progress (I)** — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
- **Achieved (A)** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
- **Maintaining (M)** — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation: Three-Tiered Intervention System and Problem-Solving Process (Cont’d)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Intervention integrity is documented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Response to intervention is evaluated through systematic data collection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Changes are made to intervention based on student response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Parents are routinely involved in implementation of interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments/Evidence:**

---

* Adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPSI v. 1.6
Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training (CSEIT)
Loyola University Chicago
### PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont’d)

**Scale:**
- **Not Started (N)** — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
- **In Progress (I)** — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
- **Achieved (A)** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
- **Maintaining (M)** — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation: Monitoring and Action Planning</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. A strategic plan (implementation plan) exists and is used by the School-Based Leadership Team to guide implementation of PS/RtI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year to review data and implementation issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The School-Based Leadership Team meets at least twice each year with the District Leadership Team to review data and implementation issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Changes are made to the implementation plan as a result of school and district leadership team data-based decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Feedback on the outcomes of the PS/RtI Project is provided to school-based faculty and staff at least yearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments/Evidence:**

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

* Adapted from the IL-ASPIRE SAPSI v. 1.6
Center for School Evaluation, Intervention and Training (CSEIT)
Loyola University Chicago