

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' REPORTING OF FACTORS THAT
IMPACT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

BY

PAULA BROOKS, B.B.A., M. Ed.

DENTON, TEXAS

SPRING, 2019

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
DENTON TEXAS

April 1, 2019

To the Dean of the Graduate School:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Paula Brooks entitled "Elementary Teachers' and Principals' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention." I have examined this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Special Education.

Jane Pemberton, PhD, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Jane Pemberton, Department Chair
Diane Myers
Jerry Whitworth
Randa Keeley

Accepted:

Dean of the Graduate School

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother Gloria Mack and my grandmother, Helen Huckaby. Although they were not able to be here to share this moment with me, their memories linger on and have continued to push me to complete this endeavor and leave a legacy for my daughter as well as my nieces and nephews.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first acknowledge God for giving me the strength and perseverance to complete this chapter of my life.

Dr. Jane Pemberton, as my dissertation chairperson, I would like to thank you whole heartedly for providing constant encouragement, support, and a wealth of knowledge. Your thoughtful feedback strengthened my study and provided direction through each step of the process.

I am appreciative of the guidance and support from the members of my doctoral committee throughout this program. I am appreciative of Dr. Diane Meyers, Dr. Randa Keeley, and Dr. Jerry Whitworth for taking the time to review my dissertation. Your encouraging words of advice were needed and greatly appreciated.

Dr. Marion Mouton your help, words of advice, and continuous push for me to complete this journey were greatly needed and appreciated.

Pastor James Womack your prayers and continuous questions about my progress on my dissertation always came at the right moment. Nkosi Smith your encouragement, prayers, and kind words will never be forgotten.

A host of other family members, friends, and others that kept encouraging me to keep going and not give up.

My daughter, Kennedy, my reason for being. It is because of you that I completed this project.

ABSTRACT

PAULA BROOKS

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' REPORTING OF FACTORS THAT IMPACT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

MAY 2019

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that impact the implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI) as reported by teachers and principals. A non-experimental research survey design was used. Section one and two of the survey consisted of demographic information. Section three consisted of the research questions. The five components of RTI (universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis) were the independent variables in this study. The dependent variables in this study were the factors (knowledge, implementation, materials, and time) that impact the implementation of the RTI process on campus. The participants were asked about their levels of knowledge, level of campus implementation, availability of materials, and the amount of time needed to effectively implement the components of RTI, universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis. The sample for the study consisted of 29 elementary teachers and 15 elementary principals in a North Central Texas urban school district.

Findings from the study indicated that teachers' overall level of knowledge, level of campus implementation, and materials of universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis were slightly less in comparison to principals. Overall, both teachers and principals reported having less time to implement universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis. Additional data indicated teachers and principals were most confident in data analysis implementation and least confident in scientific based instruction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATIONS.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of the Study	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	5
Definitions of Terms.....	5
Assumptions	6
Limitations	7
Summary.....	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
Response to Intervention.....	11
Teacher and Principal Perceptions.....	13
Role of Teachers and Principals	14
Student Achievement	15
Factors that Impact the Implementation of RTI.....	17
Summary.....	20
III. METHODOLOGY	21
Participants.....	21
Recruitment of Participants.....	22
Data Collection Procedures.....	22
Research Design.....	23

Instrumentation	23
Data Analysis	25
IV. RESULTS	27
Demographic Information.....	28
Descriptive Analyses	32
Research Question One.....	32
Research Question Two	36
Research Question Three	40
Qualitative Data	46
RTI Implementation Support	46
V. DISCUSSION.....	47
Research Question One.....	47
Research Question Two	48
Research Question Three	49
Qualitative Data	52
Limitations	54
Future Research	54
REFERENCES	56
APPENDICES	
A. Letter of Approval.....	67
B. IRB Approval Letter.....	69
C. Teacher and Principal Email	71
D. Survey	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....	29
2. Means and Standard Deviations of Years of Experience.....	31
3. Means and Standard Deviations for Survey of Elementary Teachers' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention	35
4. Means and Standard Deviations for Survey of Elementary Principals' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention	39
5. Means and Standard Deviations for Survey of Elementary Teachers' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention Compared to Principals' Reporting	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In our nation's educational system, increased emphasis has been placed on how to provide services to students who are struggling in their classes (Dyson, 2010; Ockerman, Mason, & Hollenbeck, 2012). The Children's Specific Learning Disability Act of 1969 marked the first legislative treatment of this issue. Currently, inclusion of Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) is one of 13 separate categories of disabilities in the 2004 Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) (Developmental Studies Center, 2011). Increased interest in this disability is warranted as there are 52 percent of individuals identified under IDEIA as SLD (Gersten & Dimino, 2011; Response to Intervention, 2010). Professionals have struggled to reach a consensus on how SLD should be defined, identified, and treated, particularly in terms of what interventions should be implemented for students who demonstrate SLD in the school system (Hoover & Love, 2011; Ryan, Kaffenberger, & Carroll, 2011).

The Response to Intervention (RTI) model can be used to address students who are struggling and to identify students who may be eligible for services under the SLD category (Brozo, 2009; Hughes & Dexter, 2011; Machek & Nelson, 2010; Northhouse, 2010). The RTI model has been defined as a support framework for schools that facilitates the application of interventions and evidence-based teaching practices with a

view to enhancing student outcomes (Theoharis, 2010). The RTI process measures individual student learning based on an academic response continuum (Sansosti, Telzrow, & Noltemeyer, 2010; Stetter & Hughes, 2010). Researchers and policymakers have recognized the RTI model as a tool for addressing the learning needs of students, as it places emphasis on identifying students who are at-risk, including detection of learning deficits, decreasing identification bias due to the structured assessment system and tiered criteria, and the tailoring of instruction to certain abilities, standards and assessment processes (White, Polly, & Audette, 2012).

The RTI model focuses on the provision of effective preventive measures throughout the school system with a view to enhancing the early identification of students who require additional interventions. The RTI model requires a comprehensive assessment process that can facilitate student screening in schools and the continual assessment of students identified as manifesting possible learning issues before recommending for special education assessment (Harvey, Yssel, Bauserman, & Merbler, 2010; Rinaldi, Averill, & Stuart, 2011).

The Special Education Leadership and Quality Teacher Initiative performed a national survey which reported a majority of the states, along with the District of Columbia, have or are planning to adopt an RTI or similar method of addressing student needs (Hill, King, Lemons, & Partanen, 2012; Sansosti, Noltemeyer, & Gross, 2010). The survey also reported that RTI was the most frequently implemented initiative for students who are at high risk of failure (Shores, 2012).

There are different elements in the RTI process, including universal screening, tiered instruction, scientifically based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis (Ball & Trammell, 2011; Maier et al., 2016). The process requires cooperation between all school employees in order to apply the RTI system across all three RTI tiers (Jones & Ball, 2012; Orosco & Klingner, 2010).

Teachers and principals are of critical importance in the implementation of RTI (Swanson, Solis, Ciullo, & McKenna, 2012). The success of RTI in an individual school begins with: (1) the principal's responsibilities and the teacher's role in fostering consensus within school teams; (2) an understanding and belief in the need for change; and (3) the principal's and teacher's leadership during the process of change (Ball & Trammell, 2011). Not only must teachers and principals understand the components of RTI, they must embrace it as a cultural shift for the entire school community to ensure successful implementation (Cadima, Leal, & Burchinal, 2010; Spanneut, Tobin, & Ayers, 2012). Therefore, examining factors that impact RTI implementation as perceived by teachers and principals can provide greater insights into the success of all students.

Statement of the Problem

When teachers and principals effectively facilitate and monitor the RTI process for students, the expectation is established that academic achievement will increase. Teachers and principals need the required knowledge in measuring student achievement, implementing research-based instruction and interventions, establishing procedures for

referral and placement, various service delivery options, and student support teams (Burns & Riley-Tillman, 2009; Johnston, 2010).

Further analysis is required to identify the factors that impact the implementation of RTI (Burns et al., 2013; O'Connor & Freeman, 2012). Studies have cited specific factors that influence the application of the RTI model (Cutler, 2009; Dulaney, 2010). For instance, Culot (2011) identified time for intervention implementation as a key factor while Burns et al. (2013) respectively cited school staff collaboration, trust between teachers, leadership, resources and the accessibility of interventions and staff as key factors that may impact RTI implementation. These factors can influence decisions made using RTI in terms of student academic progress.

Significance of the Study

It is important to identify information related to factors that enhance and hinder the implementation of RTI (Culot, 2011; Tubpun, 2013). Knowledge of the factors that facilitate RTI implementation can enhance RTI outcomes and ensure that students are given continuous service based on their specific needs (Lembke, Garman, Deno, & Stecker, 2010; Tubpun, 2013). This could benefit teachers and principals as they implement the RTI model and prevent the interference of any factors that may hinder the process. Knowledge of the factors that impact RTI implementation can increase the quality of RTI training and implementation for all school staff.

Purpose of the Study

While research has reported factors that impact the overall RTI implementation, more research is needed to support the implementation of RTI (Culot, 2011; Machek & Nelson, 2010). The purpose of this study is to examine factors that impact the implementation of RTI as reported by teachers and principals.

Research Questions

1. What factors impact the implementation of the RTI process with students according to elementary teachers?
2. What factors impact the implementation of the RTI process with students according to elementary principals?
3. How do the responses of elementary teachers and principals compare regarding factors that impact the implementation of RTI?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Universal Screening- a type of assessment that is the first step in identifying students who are at risk for learning difficulties (Johnson, Mellard, Fuchs, & McKnight, 2006).

Tiered Instruction- a model in which the instruction delivered to students varies on several dimensions, such as levels of increasingly intense interventions, which are related to the nature and severity of the student's difficulties (Fuchs, Mock, Morgan, & Young, 2003).

Scientific Based Instruction- an instructional program or collection of practices tested through formal scientific research and shown to have a record of success to improve learning (Fuchs & Deshler, 2007).

Progress Monitoring - a set of assessment procedures using an ongoing approach for frequent measurement of student proficiency in the core educational skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic); usually administered at predetermined intervals to allow for timely modification of instructional practices (Johnson et al., 2006).

Data Analysis - is the use of data collection to make instructional decisions based on assessment data (Ehren, Ehren, & Proly, 2009).

Assumptions

This study assumes that teachers' and principals' responses to survey questions are accurate and represented by their individual interpretation regarding RTI at their individual campuses, including preparedness and the extent of implementation. This study also assumes that the participants will honestly respond to the survey questions. It is further assumed that 10 ten elementary schools in this study were actively attempting to implement a school-wide RTI model during the 2018-2019 school year. A teacher's and principal's level of control and capacity to implement effective RTI programs may be impacted by legal requirements, district policies, and other issues that may be specific to their campus.

Limitations

This study is limited to elementary school teachers and principals from one urban school district in North Central Texas. The study focused on 10 elementary schools. Results may not generalize to a larger population of teachers and principals. Another possible limitation may be the sample size and the recruiting of participants. The randomization of this study is another potential limitation. Results may be affected by the number of responses and voluntary participation. While possible limitations may exist, this study can produce significant findings that may contribute to the research of elementary school teachers and principals and their perceptions regarding factors that impact RTI implementation.

Summary

The RTI model can be an effective method of service delivery designed to help identify students at risk and work with all students to ensure successful academic outcomes. The RTI model is a schoolwide framework that encompasses universal screening, multi-tiered instruction, scientifically based instruction, on-going progress monitoring, and data analysis to meet the needs of each individual student.

To implement RTI effectively, teachers and principals must fully commit in order for significant change to take place. Teachers and principals must become familiar with a structured problem-solving process, understand scientifically based interventions, and know how to use various methods to assess and monitor student progress.

The objective of this study was to explore elementary teachers and principals' reporting of factors that impact the implementation of RTI on their campuses. Information gathered through this study may have implications for educational practices to increase student academic achievement.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In 1975 Congress approved the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA), also referred as Public Law 94-142. Evidence indicates that more than half of the eight million children with disabilities in the country in 1974 did not receive a proper education with many not receiving any educational services whatsoever (Turnbull III, 2009). In addition, the federal government made no provisions for the education of children with disabilities, despite them often having greater needs than children who did not have disabilities. Some children with disabilities were not permitted to enter the public school system prior to 1975 and were not allowed to participate in general education classes (Keogh, 2007; Longmore, 2009). Instead, children with disabilities were often institutionalized and not provided with any education or rehabilitative services (Longmore, 2009).

The EAHCA represented the first step towards offering an education to all students with disabilities (Hardman & Dawson, 2008; Keogh, 2007) and observed the civil rights of students with disabilities to receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education (Keogh, 2007; Turnbull III, 2009). This law guaranteed educational equality for all students despite any physical defects and altered the manner in which society treats and regards the requirements of students with disabilities by including them in the public school system (Hosp, Hosp, & Howell, 2007).

The federal government has focused on the provision of a quality education for students with disabilities since the passing of EAHCA. While this act represented a significant step towards educational equality, its theoretical framework generated low expectations for students with disabilities. Thus, further modifications were required (May, 2009). In effect, including children with disabilities to enter the public school system did little to prevent discrimination as these students were typically misdiagnosed and not offered suitable services for their needs; in addition, they were often not integrated with non-disabled students and schools did not collaborate effectively with the parents (Turnbull III, 2009). Thus, considering these limitations as well as the generation of fresh knowledge on the disabilities, a series of amendments were made to the EAHCA. A recent amendment was passed in 2004 and renamed as the IDEIA, otherwise known as Public Law 108-446 (Turnbull III, 2009). The IDEIA's goal is to achieve cohesive and individualized educational progress that is continually monitored for all students with disabilities (Hardman & Dawson, 2008). There are 13 disability categories contained in the IDEIA (Thomas & Zirkel, 2010). The IDEIA made a number of modifications to the EAHCA but the primary aim was to devise an education system with aligned objectives in terms of general and special education services (May, 2009). IDEIA was written in conjunction with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 which focused on the operation of public schools across the country (Cooper-Duffy, Szedia, & Hyer, 2010; Moore, 2009; Turnbull III, 2009).

NCLB has two key objectives, the first is to close the achievement gap between Caucasian students and minority students, including a subset of students who have

disabilities. The second objective is to achieve greater student outcomes in all content areas by 2014 (Shirvani, 2009). The NCLB provides for all children and makes all schools responsible for making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in teaching students with disabled and non-disabled students alike (Cooper-Duffy et al., 2010). However, as the NCLB had different expectations than early versions of the IDEIA, modifications were made to the latter in order to better align the objectives of each Act.

Response to Intervention

The reauthorization of IDEA (2004) provided an option to the discrepancy or wait-to-fail model to identify students with a SLD as the primary means of identification. Instead, schools were to assess how students responded to scientifically based interventions as a diagnostic tool before a special education referral was made. As a result, the RTI model was created. According to the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRI, 2017), all states including the District of Columbia used the RTI model in 2017 to identify and measure specific learning disabilities. In addition, 61% of elementary schools, 45% of middle schools, and 29% of high schools report the use of the RTI framework.

The RTI is a multi-tiered model designed to enhance the learning outcomes of all students by providing comprehensive screening services, continual monitoring, appropriate instructional interventions and fidelity monitoring of curriculum and interventions (Fuchs et al., 2003; Skinner, McCleary, Skolits, Poncy & Cates, 2013). The first tier of RTI typically comprises quality instruction and universal screening in the public system using curriculum-based metrics or alternative methods that measure the

progress of all students (Glover & DiPerna, 2007; Skinner et al., 2013). Students who are making inadequate progress using the universal screening method proceed to Tier 2, which contains a greater intensity or frequency of academic instruction, generally using smaller classroom environments. On Tier 2, the progress of students is continually monitored.

In the event that a student's academic achievement reaches that of their peers during Tier 2, the student will be transferred to Tier 1 once again. If a student struggles in Tier 2, the student can move to Tier 3 to receive intensive one-on-one measures. If academic progress is made, the student is transferred sequentially back through the tiers. If no academic progress is made, the student may be referred for a special education evaluation as part of Tier 3 (Canter, Klotz & Cowen, 2008).

According to Shores (2012), there are further tiers in some schools after Tier 3. Using the RTI model, the tiers indicate the extent to which a student is performing relative to their grade. For instance, Tier 3 may offer services for those who are performing academically approximately one year below their grade, while those performing between 1 and 2 years lower may be moved to Tier 4. Tier 5 offers support to those who are underperforming at their grade level by two years or more. Nonetheless, despite the existence of a five-tier system, the RTI is generally regarded as a three-tier model (Canter et al., 2008). Whether a special education evaluation is performed after Tier 3 or as part of Tier 3, the application of the RTI model in enabling such an evaluation necessitates that students obtain consistent service as they progress through all RTI tiers. The service provided must comprise monitoring, data collection and a

differentiated instruction that increases incrementally in terms of frequency, duration and individualization. To achieve consistency of service, the cooperation of all school employees is imperative (Canter et al., 2008).

Advocates of the RTI model found that the initiative increases teaching quality for all students and generates valuable insights into how students develop within a general classroom environment (Burns et al., 2013; Gersten & Dimino, 2011). RTI may improve academic outcomes by focusing on the specific learning requirements of individual students through regular monitoring, differentiated instruction and interventions where appropriate (Mellard, McKnight, & Jordan, 2010; Skinner et al., 2013). However, the success of the model depends largely on how it is designed and how it is implemented (O'Connor & Freeman, 2012).

Teacher and Principal Perceptions

The RTI model can facilitate the equal representation of subset student populations in special education programs and increase the quality of instructional methods and student outcomes (O'Connor & Freeman, 2012; Skinner et al., 2013). Therefore, it is naturally assumed that all school staff would be advocates of a model that is beneficial for students despite it requiring significant modifications to standard policies and practices. According to Bartle (2009), although some staff implied that they were dissatisfied with the RTI in terms of teacher accountability, many others displayed an increasing appreciation for the accountability element as the program progressed. Further studies by Daino-Garcia (2008) and Lembke, Hampton, and Beyers (2012) demonstrated

that teachers were able to establish different academic goals using RTI, primarily through data collection, which they felt would have a positive impact on academic interventions.

Sansosti, Notlemeyer, and Gross (2010) surveyed high school principals across the country and reported the majority responding had a positive attitude towards the RTI model despite the extensive modifications necessitated by its implementation. Similar findings were generated by Unruh and McKeller (2013) and O'Connor and Freeman (2012) who reported that the majority of teachers endorse the RTI model and the accuracy of the model in identifying SLDs. The most significant benefits to the model were reported by principals and school psychologists who report that RTI eliminates ineffective instruction methods, facilitates continuous academic progress, facilitates the identification of at-risk students, and provides for the performance of formative assessments (O'Connor & Freeman, 2012).

Role of Teachers and Principals

Schools can create an RTI system that best suits their specific needs and available resources due to the inherent flexibility of the model. However, the outcome generally varies according to how the system is implemented by teachers and principals (Tubpun, 2013; Wright, Ellemor-Collins, & Tabor, 2012). As such, the effectiveness of the model will be negatively influenced if the teachers or principals are not capable or willing to implement it properly. Nunn, Jantz, and Butikofer (2009) analyzed the link between the Teacher Efficacy Beliefs and Behaviors Scale (TEBBS) and indicators of RTI effectiveness (RTI Effectiveness Scale-IRES) based on data collected from 429 kindergarten through 12th grade educators. They reported the perceived outcomes and

effectiveness of RTI programs improved as well as the quality of collaboration, decision-making and overall results when teachers focused on implementing the program more effectively (Macheck & Nelson, 2010).

Principals have a significant impact on the successful implementation of RTI as they offer support to teachers and the school as a whole (Dulaney, 2010; O'Connor & Freeman, 2012). More specifically, the majority of administrative tasks relating to RTI are completed by principals, such as satisfying mandates and ensuring quality of practice (Martinez & Young, 2011; Moors, Weisenburgh-Snyder, & Robbins, 2010). In addition, principals play a key role in cultivating a positive school climate in terms of RTI implementation and encouraging communication between all staff. It has also been found that principals play an important role in establishing high standards, setting a clear vision for the problem-solving process, and providing individual teacher support (O'Connor & Freeman, 2012).

Student Achievement

Research suggests that specific interventions offered as part of the RTI model have a positive effect on academic outcomes. According to O'Conner, Harty, and Fulmer (2005), a Tier 3 intervention designed to enhance phonemic awareness skills was effective in improving the abilities of students in two elementary schools. Services were provided to 92 students according to their individual academic needs. All students in Tier 1 were provided data-based universal reading instruction. Students in Tier 2 were placed in fluid small groups to receive targeted reading instruction 3 days per week. Students placed in Tier 3 reading intervention received individualized instruction 5 days a

week. The results of the study found that students that received the RTI interventions outperformed the students that did not receive any interventions. The study further showed that a reduction in students referred for SLD testing was reduced for the students receiving the tiered instruction (O’Conner, Harty, & Fulmer, 2005).

A similar study by Hagans (2008) explored the effect of a specific intervention on the reading skills of 75 first graders from three different elementary schools. The researcher intentionally divided the students by socio-economic background based on which students were in receipt of a free or reduced-price lunch. Each group was assigned an early literacy reading intervention for ten weeks or a math intervention. The former group, the experiment group, received this intervention for 20 to 25 minutes per day over four days. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy (DIBELS): Phoneme Segmentations and Nonsense Word Fluency were applied to measure reading skills before, during and after the intervention. The findings indicated that 96 percent of students in the lower-income group reached the established learning goal in contrast to 64 percent in the control group (Hagans, 2008).

The effect of RTI implementation on three cohort groups of elementary grade English language learners was investigated by Eversole (2010) at varying stages of implementation. Data was obtained on the first cohort before the beginning of the intervention in terms of reading achievement and SLD eligibility. Each cohort group contained 665, 895, and 876 students respectively. The findings indicated that the adequate yearly progress score increased with RTI implementation. Generally speaking,

the number of students who would be deemed eligible for special education services declined with the application of RTI interventions (Eversole, 2010).

Scott (2010) reported that there was no significant difference between the academic results of struggling readers attending a high school that did not implement RTI and students with reading difficulties who attended a school that implemented RTI. Allaman (2008) found that RTI had little effect on academic performance over a two-year period based on a study of 170 second grade students in two different school districts using the DIBELS: Oral Reading Fluency metric to measure student progress. In this case, one school implemented the RTI while the other did not (Allaman, 2008).

Furthermore, other evidence suggests that implementation of the RTI model may not generate results consistent enough to determine SLD eligibility. Thus, the outcome of an RTI system depends on the type and quality of the program implemented in a specific school (Rodriguez, 2010). According to Burns et al. (2010), 40% of students may be influenced by the type of RTI decision-making system selected by a school, which indicates that many students may not be given the services or supports they require. As such, it is clear that the design and method of RTI decision-making will have a direct impact on the performance of the model and its ability to make accurate SLD referrals (Feuerborn, Sarin, & Tyre, 2011).

Factors that Impact the Implementation of RTI

Effective RTI implementation requires that teachers receive adequate intervention materials, proper training, time to collaborate, and clear expectations (Robinson, Bursuck, & Sinclair, 2013). Several researchers cite time as an influencing factor of RTI

implementation, including Bartle (2009), Brinker (2012), and Palenchar (2012). Werts, Carpenter, and Fewell (2014) assert that teachers often feel that they do not have time to apply interventions while Dulaney (2010) found that student assessments required a significant investment of time. On the contrary, teachers who had ample time to implement RTI programs and perform assessments were keen advocates of the RTI model (Dulaney, 2010). One study found that greater collaboration improved the capacity of teachers to offer differentiated instruction for students with many revealing that they were largely dependent on the cooperation and experience of other employees in deploying the model successfully (Cutler, 2009). Several researchers found that the absence of effective collaboration and trust as well as staff shortages were key factors that hindered the implementation process (Bartle, 2009; Cutler, 2009; Daino-Garcia, 2008; Dulaney, 2010).

Other factors that hinder the RTI implementation process include the absence of training and information on the model (Bartle, 2009; Cutler, 2009; Dulaney, 2010). According to Orosco and Klingner (2010), the absence of teacher training programs and intervention systems hinder the effectiveness of RTI and data-based decisions in relation to SLDs. According to Cutler (2009) and Fuchs, Fuchs, and Stecker (2010), teachers were not adequately trained in how to perform data analysis or offer differentiated instruction. Similarly, Newman-Jacobs found that many teachers were not aware of the objectives of RTI, namely the purpose of the model in facilitating special education referrals and identifying SLDs. Furthermore, teachers regard professional development as a key factor facilitating RTI implementation (Fountas & Pinnell, 2011). The majority

of teachers reported that additional training in the implementation of interventions would be of significant benefit.

Daino-Garcia (2008) reported that ineffective interventions were perceived by teachers as inhibiting factors of the RTI process. Cutler (2009) found that prepackaged, ready to use interventions were well-received by many teachers while Milosovic (2007) reported scripted reading intervention lessons yielded minimal student success.

Therefore, many critics are concerned that scripted curriculum becomes too narrowly focused, and does not allow teachers to employ reading interventions. The relative lack of parental involvement was also cited as an inhibiting factor (Cutler, 2009) with many teachers indicating that collaboration with the parent-teacher association had a positive effect on the implementation process. Teachers may have avoided collaborating with parents due to their own lack of knowledge on RTI and an inability to convey the purpose of the program to parents.

The absence of effective leadership from principals and school administration was also cited as a hindrance (Dulaney, 2010). Furthermore, effective leadership was found to have a positive impact on the implementation of the RTI model (Cutler, 2009). This argument is supported by Newman-Jacobs who reported a case where the RTI model can be difficult to maintain once leadership changes occurred. Interventions can also be inhibited by inadequate financial resources or staff availability (Cutler, 2009). Therefore, inadequate funding is also a key inhibitor to RTI implementation and may affect the capacity of a school to deploy and maintain the program successfully (Greenfield, Rinaldi, Proctor, & Cardarelli, 2010).

Summary

Research has shown that teachers and principals are key to effective schools and student achievement (Shepherd & Salembier, 2011). It is imperative for teachers and principals to fulfill the campus instructional leader role in all effective schools (Cooper-Duffy et al., 2010). When schools implement new practices and associated changes, as with the implementation of the RTI model, factors impact successful implementation. Schools that enjoy great success have teachers and principals who demonstrate excellence in creating a framework for change.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research population, research design, evaluative measures, as well as data collection and analysis for the research methodology are presented in this chapter. The study targeted an urban school district in North Central Texas to examine elementary teachers and principals' perceptions of their level of knowledge of the RTI process and of factors that impact the level of implementation of the RTI process on their campus. A survey method was utilized to conduct this research.

Participants

The participant population for this study consisted of elementary school teachers and principals from an urban school district in North Central Texas. This district employs 66 campus administrators and over 1900 total employees. The district has over 15,000 students. The district's student demographic breakdown is 44% African American, 32% Hispanic, 15.5% Caucasian, 4.5% Asian/Pacific Islander, 4% Other, 64% Economically Disadvantaged, 14% English Language Learners, 45% At-Risk, and 9% students with disabilities. The district has 23 campuses of which 13 are secondary or alternative schools. There are 10 elementary schools in the district. Each elementary school campus has at least two administrators (the principal and the assistant principal). The number of teachers in each elementary building ranges from 30 to 50. All elementary school teachers and principals were included in this study.

Recruitment of Participants

Participants in the study were selected by utilizing purposeful sampling. In purposeful sampling, a group of subjects is selected based on the needs of the study as well as on specific characteristics of a population of interest (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Participants' ages, ethnicity background, number of years of experience, educational background, and other factors are different among the participants. Teachers' eligibility requires a Texas Educator Certificate. Principals' eligibility requires a Texas Principal Certificate and a Texas Educator Certificate.

Data Collection Procedures

The process for collecting data included several procedures. First, the researcher requested approval from the Executive Director of Elementary Leadership in the selected district (see Appendix A) and from the university Institutional Review Board (see Appendix B). Following the approvals, an email letter (see Appendix C) was sent to the campus principals requesting their voluntary participation for their school in the study and to invite teachers to participate in the study.

The email letter described the purpose, nature of the study, and requested the teachers and principals' participation by asking them to complete an online survey regarding factors that impact the implementation of RTI. The email letter included a link containing written acknowledgement of participants' rights and assurance of privacy regarding their information and a link to the online survey for the research study. The email letter indicated that each participant's submission of the online survey constituted

their consent to participate. If a teacher or principal chose not to participate, there were no resulting consequences or data collected.

The completed surveys were used for data analysis purposes upon completion of the study. The researcher provided a summation of the survey results to any person who requests the data. Requests for results of survey were made by completing the request at the end of the survey using a link.

Research Design

A non-experimental survey design (see Appendix D) was used to conduct research. The five components of RTI (universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis) were the independent variables in this study. The dependent variables were the solicited responses to survey questions regarding the teachers' and principals' perception of factors (knowledge, implementation, materials, and time) that impact the RTI process on campus. The factors were used to determine the difference between levels of knowledge, level of campus implementation, availability of materials, and the amount of time needed to effectively implement the components of RTI. Teacher and principal perceptions were compared to the RTI components that were identified to effectively implement the RTI model.

Instrumentation

The survey, *Elementary Teachers' and Principals' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention* was developed for this research project. The survey was designed to assess elementary school teachers and principals' perception level of factors that impact the RTI process on their campus.

The survey instrument was developed utilizing the following methods: A review of the literature on RTI that focused on factors that impacted implementation was completed. Each research study was examined to ensure the RTI process was implemented. The data from the various research studies indicated the RTI process either positively affected student progress, made little impact on student academic gains, or did not generate results consistent enough to determine next steps. Specifically, this was achieved by reviewing the study and confirming the students made academic growth as a result of the implementation process. Data from the studies further showed that factors such as time, collaboration, training, leadership, interventions, funding, and parental involvement all enhanced or hindered the implementation of the RTI process with the conditions of the research methodology.

The survey was given to three teachers and three principals from a district outside of the target district with a request for feedback. Changes were made based on feedback. The survey instrument consisted of four sections: (1) participant demographic information, (2) school demographic information, (3) teacher and principal perceptions on RTI components, and (4) open-ended statements. There were twenty-three questions.

Section One of the survey included: gender, ethnicity, age, level of education, route to teacher certification, route to administrator certification, total years of general education experience, total years of special education experience, total years as a principal and/or assistant principal, and approximate number of continuing education hours relative to RTI. Section Two of the survey pertained to the school demographics.

This section asked for information regarding Title I status, approximate percentage of economically disadvantaged students, and approximate number of students at the campus.

Section Three of the survey included one question requesting participants' overall knowledge of RTI. This section also included twenty questions with four parts requesting the teachers and principals' perceptions level of knowledge, level of campus implementation, availability of materials, and the amount of time needed to effectively implement the components of RTI. The RTI components included within the survey were universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis. The participants were asked to read the definition of each RTI component as the basis for completing the survey. Participants were asked to respond by using a five-item Likert scale: (1) *limited*, (2) *somewhat limited*, (3) *moderate*, (4) *somewhat extensive*, and (5) *extensive*.

Section Four of the survey included two open-ended qualitative questions. The first question asked participants "What could your district or campus do to support you with Response to Intervention." The second open-ended question asked participants "What were additional comments regarding RTI." The purpose of this section was to allow teachers and principals to note any questions not addressed in the survey instrument.

Data Analysis

The study explored the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. A mean analysis was conducted to determine specifically what factors played a role in elementary school teachers' and principals' perceptions toward

the implementation of factors that impact RTI implementation. The researcher used descriptive statistics to analyze the demographic data. A recursive abstraction approach was utilized to answer the open-ended research statements. Participant responses to the qualitative questions were grouped into categories. The researcher used tables to summarize the survey data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study is to examine factors that impact the implementation of RTI as reported by teachers and principals. The data were analyzed using a descriptive statistics mean analysis to determine factors that played a role in elementary school teachers and principals' reporting of factors that impact RTI implementation. The factors include knowledge, implementation, materials, and time.

A survey was developed and administered online to elementary teachers and principals. Sections One and Two of the survey consisted of demographic information that was used for grouping and comparing responses to survey items. The variables from the demographics that were included are participant gender, ethnicity, age, years of experience, level of education, route to certification, and hours of professional development.

Section Three of the survey contained five RTI components from the literature that were identified to effectively implement the RTI model. The five components included universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis. Section Four contained qualitative comments and asked participants to list what they thought their district or campus could do to support with RTI and any additional comments.

Demographic Information

This sample was comprised of 45 teachers and 15 principals. Out of the 60 participants, 29 teachers and 15 principals responded with complete responses that were included in the data analysis. As shown in Table 1, a majority of the participants were female (90.57%). The demographics of the teachers and principals were approximately one-half participants for the Caucasian (49.1%) subgroup. The African American (43.4%), Hispanic (3.8%), Asian/Pacific Islander (3.8%), and American Indian (0%) were the remaining subgroups. The participants' were between the ages of 60 years old or older (5.7%), between the ages of 50 and 59 (20.8%), between the ages of 40 and 49 (34.0%), between the ages of 30 and 39 (28.3%), and between the ages of 20 and 29 (11.3%). A majority of participants (56.6%) had a master's degree, one participant had a doctoral degree (1.9%), and the remaining participants (41.5%) had a bachelor's degree.

As also shown in Table 1, a majority of participants (90.9%) had a university based administrator certification and (71.7%) of participants had a university based teacher certification. As to number of hours of professional development, (32.1%) of participants reported completing 0 to 6 hours of professional development, (39.6%) completed 7-18 hours, and (28.3%) completed 18 or more hours. Finally, a majority of participants reported their school as being a Title I campus (88.2%).

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	<i>N</i>	%
Gender		
Male	5	9.43
Female	48	90.57
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	26	49.1
African American	23	43.4
Hispanic	2	3.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	3.8
American Indian	0	0
Age		
20 to 29 Years	6	11.3
30 to 39 Years	15	28.3
40 to 49 Years	18	34
50 to 59 Years	11	20.8
60 Years or Older	3	5.7
Level of Education		
Bachelor's	22	41.5
Master's	30	56.6
Doctorate	1	1.9
Route to Teacher Certification		
University Based	38	71.7
Alternative Certification	15	28.3
Route to Administrator Certification		
University Based	30	90.9
Alternative Certification	3	9.1
Professional Development		
0 hours	1	1.9
1-3 hours	3	5.7
4-6 hours	13	24.5
7-18 hours	21	39.6
18+ hours	15	28.3

Note. Frequencies not equaling 60 reflect missing data

As shown in Table 2, participants' total years of general education experience ranged from 1 to 33 years, with a mean of ($M = 11.75, SD = 8.79$). Participants' total years of general education experience in their current district ranged from 1 to 24 years, with a mean of ($M = 5.65, SD = 6.90$). Participants' total years of special education experience ranged from 1 to 21 years, with a mean of ($M = 11.75, SD = 8.79$). Participants' total years of special education experience in their current district ranged from 1 to 13 years, with a mean of ($M = 5.65, SD = 6.90$). Additionally, the total number of years as a principal ranged from 1 to 20 years, with a mean of ($M = 1.72, SD = 4.16$). Participants' total years as a principal in their current district ranged from 1 to 14 years, with a mean of ($M = 1.12, SD = 2.93$).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Years of Experience

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Range
Total Years General Education Experience	53	11.75	8.79	1-33
Total Years Gen. Educ. Current District	52	5.65	6.90	1-24
Total Years Special Education	53	11.75	8.79	1-21
Total Years Spec. Educ. Current	52	5.65	6.90	1-13
Total Years as Principal	50	1.72	4.16	1-20
Total Years as Principal Current	48	1.12	2.93	1-14

Note. Frequencies not equaling 60 reflect missing data

Descriptive Analyses

Research Question One

Research Question 1: What factors impact the implementation of the RTI process with students according to elementary teachers?

Participants were asked to respond to a survey with a 5-point Likert Scale: (1) limited, (2) somewhat limited, (3) moderate, (4) somewhat extensive, and (5) extensive. A mean analysis was performed to investigate teachers' knowledge of factors that impact the implementation of RTI. The independent variables were the five components of RTI (universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis). The dependent variables were teacher responses to the factors (knowledge, implementation, materials, and time).

As shown in Table 3, teachers rated their overall knowledge of RTI with a mean score of ($M = 3.51, SD = .82$). Teachers rated their level of knowledge of universal screening with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.24, SD = 1.09$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of universal screening with a mean score of ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.22$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of universal screening with a mean score of ($M = 3.00, SD = 1.36$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of universal screening with the lowest mean score of ($M = 2.37, SD = 1.01$).

Teachers rated their level of implementation of tiered instruction with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.39, SD = .78$). Teachers rated their level of knowledge of tiered instruction with a mean score of ($M = 3.31, SD = .84$). Teachers rated having the needed

materials for the implementation of tiered instruction with a mean score of ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.06$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of tiered instruction with the lowest mean score of ($M = 2.60, SD = .91$).

Also shown in Table 3, teachers rated their level of knowledge of scientific based instruction with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.07, SD = 1.05$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction with a mean score of ($M = 3.03, SD = 1.07$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of scientific based instruction with a mean score of ($M = 2.57, SD = 1.03$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean score of ($M = 2.35, SD = .91$).

Teachers rated their level of knowledge of progress monitoring with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.64, SD = .82$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of progress monitoring with a mean score of ($M = 3.67, SD = .81$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of progress monitoring with a mean score of ($M = 3.07, SD = 1.11$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of progress monitoring with the lowest mean score of ($M = 2.71, SD = 1.15$).

Teachers rated their level of knowledge of data analysis with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.60, SD = .91$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of data analysis with a mean score of ($M = 3.57, SD = .95$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of data analysis with a mean score of ($M = 3.39,$

$SD = .91$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis with the lowest mean score of ($M = 2.92, SD = 1.07$).

As also shown in Table 3, teachers rated their level of knowledge of progress monitoring with the highest mean ($M = 3.64, SD = .82$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.07, SD = 1.05$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of progress monitoring with the highest mean ($M = 3.67, SD = .81$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.03, SD = 1.07$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 3.39, SD = .91$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.57, SD = 1.03$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 2.92, SD = 1.07$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.35, SD = .91$).

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Survey of Elementary Teachers' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Overall Knowledge	29	3.51	.82
Universal Screening			
Level of Knowledge	29	3.24	1.09
Level of Implementation	29	3.06	1.22
Materials	29	3.00	1.36
Time	29	2.37	1.01
Tiered Instruction			
Level of Knowledge	29	3.31	.84
Level of Implementation	28	3.39	.78
Materials	29	3.06	1.06
Time	28	2.60	.91
Scientific Based Instruction			
Level of Knowledge	28	3.07	1.05
Level of Implementation	28	3.03	1.07
Materials	28	2.57	1.03
Time	28	2.35	.91
Progress Monitoring			
Level of Knowledge	28	3.64	.82
Level of Implementation	28	3.67	.81
Materials	28	3.07	1.11
Time	28	2.71	1.15
Data Analysis			
Level of Knowledge	28	3.60	.91
Level of Implementation	28	3.57	.95
Materials	28	3.39	.91
Time	27	2.92	1.07

Note. Frequencies not equaling 60 reflect missing data

Research Question Two

Research Question 2: What factors impact the implementation of the RTI process with students according to elementary principals?

Participants were asked to respond to a survey with a 5-point Likert Scale: (1) limited, (2) somewhat limited, (3) moderate, (4) somewhat extensive, and (5) extensive. A mean analysis was performed to investigate principals' knowledge of factors that impact the implementation of RTI. The independent variables were the five components of RTI (universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis). The dependent variables were principal responses to the factors (knowledge, implementation, materials, and time).

As shown in Table 4, principals rated their overall knowledge of RTI with a mean score of ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .67$). Principals rated their level of knowledge of universal screening with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .77$). Principals rated their level of campus implementation of universal screening with a mean score of ($M = 3.73$, $SD = .96$). Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of universal screening with a mean score of ($M = 3.66$, $SD = .89$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of universal screening with the lowest mean score of ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .91$).

Principals rated their level of knowledge ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .65$) and level of campus implementation ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .65$) of tiered instruction with the highest mean scores. Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of tiered instruction with a mean score of ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .91$). Principals rated having the

necessary time for the implementation of tiered instruction with the lowest mean score of ($M = 2.80, SD = .86$).

Also shown in Table 4, principals rated their level of knowledge of scientific based instruction with the highest mean score of ($M = 3.53, SD = .91$). Principals rated their level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction with a mean score of ($M = 3.33, SD = .89$). Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of scientific based instruction with a mean score of ($M = 3.06, SD = .59$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean score of ($M = 3.06, SD = .79$).

Principals rated their level of campus implementation of progress monitoring with the highest mean score of ($M = 4.00, SD = .87$). Principals rated their level of knowledge of progress monitoring with a mean score of ($M = 4.00, SD = .92$). Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of progress monitoring with a mean score of ($M = 3.35, SD = .63$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of progress monitoring with the lowest mean score of ($M = 3.06, SD = .79$).

Principals rated their level of knowledge ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$) and level of campus implementation ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$) of data analysis with the highest mean scores. Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of data analysis with a mean score of ($M = 3.71, SD = .99$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis with the lowest mean score of ($M = 3.53, SD = .83$).

As shown in Table 4, principals rated their level of knowledge of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.53, SD = .91$). Principals rated their level of campus implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.33, SD = .89$). Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 3.71, SD = .99$) and scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.06, SD = .59$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 3.53, SD = .83$) and tiered instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.80, SD = .86$).

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Survey of Elementary Principals' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Overall Knowledge	14	4.00	.67
Universal Screening			
Level of Knowledge	15	3.80	.77
Level of Implementation	15	3.73	.96
Materials	15	3.66	.89
Time	15	3.13	.91
Tiered Instruction			
Level of Knowledge	15	4.00	.65
Level of Implementation	15	4.00	.65
Materials	15	3.46	.91
Time	15	2.80	.86
Scientific Based Instruction			
Level of Knowledge	15	3.53	.91
Level of Implementation	15	3.33	.89
Materials	15	3.06	.59
Time	15	3.06	.79
Progress Monitoring			
Level of Knowledge	15	4.00	.92
Level of Implementation	14	4.00	.87
Materials	14	3.35	.63
Time	15	3.06	.79
Data Analysis			
Level of Knowledge	15	4.13	.83
Level of Implementation	15	4.13	.83
Materials	14	3.71	.99
Time	15	3.53	.83

Note. Frequencies not equaling 60 reflect missing data

Research Question Three

Research Question 3: How do the responses of elementary teachers and principals compare regarding factors that impact the implementation of RTI?

Participants were asked to respond to a survey with a 5-point Likert Scale: (1) limited, (2) somewhat limited, (3) moderate, (4) somewhat extensive, and (5) extensive. A mean analysis was performed to investigate differences between elementary teachers and principals' knowledge of factors that impact the implementation of RTI. The independent variables were the five components of RTI (universal screening, tiered instruction, scientific based instruction, progress monitoring, and data analysis). The dependent variables were teacher and principal responses to the factors (knowledge, implementation, materials, and time).

As shown in Table 5, out of the four factors, teachers rated their level of campus implementation of progress monitoring with the highest mean ($M = 3.67, SD = .81$). Principals rated their level of campus implementation of data analysis ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$) and their level of knowledge of data analysis with the highest means ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$) out of all factors. Out of all factors, teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.35, SD = .91$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of tiered instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.80, SD = .86$) out of all factors.

As shown in Table 5, teachers rated their level of knowledge of progress monitoring with the highest mean ($M = 3.64, SD = .82$). Principals rated their level of knowledge of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 4.13, SD = .83$). Teachers rated

their level of knowledge of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 1.05$). Principals rated their level of knowledge of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .91$).

As shown in Table 5, teachers rated their level of campus implementation of progress monitoring with the highest mean ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .81$). Principals rated their level of campus implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .83$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.07$). Principals rated their level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .89$).

As also shown in Table 5, teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .91$). Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 3.71$, $SD = .99$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.03$). Principals rated having the needed materials for the implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 3.06$, $SD = .59$).

As also shown in Table 5, teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.07$). Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis with the highest mean ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .83$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of scientific based instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.35$, $SD = .91$).

Principals rated having the necessary time for the implementation of tiered instruction with the lowest mean ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .86$).

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Survey of Elementary Teachers' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention Compared to Principals' Reporting

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Overall Knowledge			
Teachers	29	3.51	.82
Principals	14	4.00	.67
Universal Screening			
Level of Knowledge			
Teachers	29	3.24	1.09
Principals	15	3.80	.77
Level of Implementation			
Teachers	29	3.06	1.22
Principals	15	3.73	.96
Materials			
Teachers	29	3.00	1.36
Principals	15	3.66	.89
Time			
Teachers	29	2.37	1.01
Principals	15	3.13	.91
Tiered Instruction			
Level of Knowledge			
Teachers	29	3.31	0.84
Principals	15	4.00	.65
Level of Implementation			
Teachers	28	3.39	.78
Principals	15	4.00	.65
Materials			
Teachers	29	3.06	1.06
Principals	15	3.46	.91
Time			
Teachers	28	2.60	.91
Principals	15	2.80	.86

Table 5 Continued

Scientific Based Instruction			
Level of Knowledge			
Teachers	28	3.07	1.05
Principals	15	3.53	.91
Level of Implementation			
Teachers	28	3.03	1.07
Principals	15	3.33	.89
Materials			
Teachers	28	2.57	1.03
Principals	15	3.06	.59
Time			
Teachers	28	2.35	.91
Principals	15	3.06	.79
Progress Monitoring			
Level of Knowledge			
Teachers	28	3.64	.82
Principals	15	4.00	.92
Level of Implementation			
Teachers	28	3.67	.81
Principals	14	4.00	.87
Materials			
Teachers	28	3.07	1.11
Principals	14	3.35	.63
Time			
Teachers	28	2.71	1.15
Principals	15	3.06	.79
Data Analysis			
Level of Knowledge			
Teachers	28	3.60	.91
Principals	15	4.13	.83
Level of Implementation			
Teachers	28	3.57	.95
Principals	15	4.13	.83
Materials			
Teachers	28	3.39	.91

Table 5 Continued

Time	Principals	14	3.71	.99
	Teachers	27	2.92	1.07
	Principals	15	3.53	.83

Note. Frequencies not equaling 60 reflect missing data

Qualitative Data

RTI Implementation Support

Participants were asked what their district or campus could do to support them with RTI. Of 44 participants, 31 teachers and principals responded to this open-ended question. Teachers and principals (3%) reported a lack of campus administrative support as a barrier to proper implementation of the RTI components. Teachers and principals (16%) reported that the lack of personnel hindered the implementation of evidence-based practices. Teachers and principals (39%) cited lack of professional development as a barrier of proper implementation. Teachers and principals (42%) reported time and lack of resources (intervention curricula) as barriers of proper implementation.

Participants were also asked to list additional comments. Of 44 participants, 4 responded to this open-ended question. One participant reported minimized instructional time due to severe behavior challenges in the classroom during intervention hour. Another participant cited lack of instructional time to close significant achievement gaps. While another participant cited lack of personnel designated to assist with preparation of intervention hour and pull out groups. Finally, coaching support for all teachers (new and experienced) was reported.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that impact the implementation of RTI as reported by elementary teachers and principals. A non-experimental survey design was used to conduct research. Data was gathered from 29 elementary teachers and 15 elementary principals. This chapter will discuss the findings of each stated research question and finally discuss the application of the findings and suggested areas for future research.

Research Question One focused on a mean analysis of elementary teachers' reporting of factors that impact the implementation of the RTI process with students. Research Question One follows:

1. What factors impact the implementation of the RTI process with students according to elementary teachers?

The result of the mean analysis demonstrated teachers ranked themselves as having a moderate overall level of knowledge of RTI ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .82$). These results suggest that teachers responded at the moderate range. Across all independent variables, teachers reported that they were most knowledgeable of progress monitoring ($M = 3.64$) and data analysis ($M = 3.60$). Daino-Garcia (2008) and Lembke, Hampton, and Beyers (2012) conducted research that indicated teachers were able to establish different academic goals using RTI, mainly through data collection, which they felt would

positively impact academic interventions. Teachers reported themselves as having a moderate ability level of campus implementation of all RTI components.

Among the four factors, teachers reported the lowest factor means for the independent variable, scientific based instruction. Teachers were least knowledgeable of scientific based instruction ($M = 3.07$). Teachers reported the lowest level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction ($M = 3.03$). Teachers were somewhat limited in having the needed materials to implement scientific based instruction ($M = 2.57$). Teachers cited having somewhat limited time to implement scientific based instruction ($M = 2.35$).

Teachers reported having somewhat limited time to implement universal screening ($M = 2.37$), tiered instruction ($M = 2.60$), progress monitoring ($M = 2.71$), and data analysis ($M = 2.92$). Palenchar (2012) and Berry (2010) asserted that teachers often feel that they do not have time to apply interventions.

Research Question Two focused on a mean analysis of elementary principals' reporting of factors that impact the implementation of the RTI process with students. Research Question Two follows:

2. What factors impact the implementation of the RTI process with students according to elementary principals?

The result of the mean analysis demonstrated principals ranked themselves as having a greater than average overall level of knowledge of RTI ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .67$). These results suggest that principals responded at the somewhat extensive range. Across all independent variables, principals reported that they were most knowledgeable of data

analysis ($M = 4.13$). Principals also reported a somewhat extensive knowledge of tiered instruction ($M = 4.00$) and progress monitoring ($M = 4.00$). Principals reported themselves as having a somewhat extensive ability level of campus implementation of tiered instruction ($M = 4.00$), progress monitoring ($M = 4.00$), and data analysis ($M = 4.13$). Sansosti, Notlemeyer and Gross (2010) surveyed principals and reported that the majority had a positive outlook towards the RTI model despite the extensive modifications required by its implementation.

Principals cited their lowest mean for time as having somewhat limited time to implement tiered instruction ($M = 2.80$). However, principals reported the lowest factor means for knowledge, implementation, and materials for the independent variable, scientific based instruction. Principals were least knowledgeable of scientific based instruction ($M = 3.53$). Principals reported the lowest level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction ($M = 3.33$). Principals reported a moderate mean score in having the needed materials to implement scientific based instruction ($M = 3.06$). Principals reported themselves as having a moderate amount of the needed materials for campus implementation of all RTI components.

Research Question Three focused on a mean analysis of elementary teachers and principals' reporting of factors that impact the implementation of the RTI process with students. Research Question Three follows:

3. How do the responses of elementary teachers and principals compare regarding factors that impact the implementation of RTI?

The result of the mean analysis demonstrated teachers ($M = 3.51$) were less confident in their overall knowledge of RTI in comparison to principals ($M = 4.00$). Teachers report having a moderate knowledge level across all RTI components. Principals report either a moderate or somewhat extensive level of knowledge across all components.

Teachers ranked themselves lower in the factors (knowledge, implementation, materials, and time) that impact the implementation of universal screening, tiered instruction, progress monitoring, scientific based instruction, and data analysis in comparison to principals. For example, teachers rated their level of knowledge of universal screening ($M = 3.24$) lower than the principal group ($M = 3.80$). Teachers rated their level of campus implementation of scientific based instruction ($M = 3.03$) lower than principals ($M = 3.33$). Teachers rated having the necessary time for the implementation of data analysis ($M = 2.92$) lower than principals ($M = 3.53$). Teachers rated having the needed materials for the implementation of tiered instruction ($M = 3.06$) lower than principals ($M = 3.46$).

Out of the five RTI components, both teachers ($M = 2.92$) and principals ($M = 3.53$) reported having the most amount of time for data analysis implementation. However, the mean analysis of the four factors, suggest that both teachers and principals are struggling with the time to implement RTI. Both teachers and principals reported having time for RTI implementation as their lowest factor. Teachers ranked themselves as having somewhat limited time ($M = 2.37$) and principals ranked themselves having a moderate amount of time ($M = 3.13$) for the implementation of universal screening.

Teachers ranked themselves as having somewhat limited time ($M = 2.35$) and principals ranked themselves having a moderate amount of time ($M = 3.06$) for the implementation of scientific based instruction. Ensuring there is an adequate amount of time in the general education classroom to implement the components of RTI effectively may enhance overall student achievement and lower the number of special education referrals. The research of Bartle (2009) and Brinker (2012) cite time as a factor impacting the implementation of RTI.

Both teachers ($M = 3.39$) and principals ($M = 3.71$) reported their highest mean score at the moderate level for having the needed materials for data analysis. Both teachers ($M = 3.07$) and principals ($M = 3.53$) reported their lowest mean score at the moderate level for knowledge of scientific based instruction. Both teachers ($M = 3.03$) and principals ($M = 3.33$) reported their lowest mean score at the moderate level for the implementation of scientific based instruction. Teachers reported a somewhat limited ($M = 2.57$) and principals ($M = 3.06$) reported a moderate level for their lowest mean score for having the needed materials for scientific based instruction.

The analysis revealed a difference between teachers and principals and level of knowledge of tiered instruction. Teachers ranked themselves as having moderate knowledge ($M = 3.31$) and principals ranked themselves with somewhat extensive knowledge ($M = 4.00$). Furthermore, a difference between teachers ($M = 3.39$) and principals ($M = 4.00$) and level of implementation of tiered instruction was shown in the data. Providing teachers with more professional development on tiered instruction may positively impact the campus implementation of the RTI process.

Teachers reported their highest mean scores for knowledge ($M = 3.64$) and implementation ($M = 3.67$) of progress monitoring. Teachers reported their highest mean scores for materials ($M = 3.39$) and time ($M = 2.92$) for the data analysis component. Principals reported their highest mean scores for knowledge ($M = 4.13$), implementation ($M = 4.13$), materials ($M = 3.71$), and time ($M = 3.53$) all for the data analysis component. Teachers reported their lowest mean scores for knowledge ($M = 3.06$), implementation ($M = 3.03$), materials ($M = 2.57$), and time ($M = 2.35$) all for the scientific based instruction component. Principals reported their lowest mean scores for knowledge ($M = 3.53$), implementation ($M = 3.33$), and materials ($M = 3.06$) all for the scientific based instruction component and time ($M = 2.80$) for the tiered instruction component.

Both teachers and principals were most confident in data analysis implementation. Teachers and principals were least confident in scientific based instruction. The data suggests that providing teachers and principals with more professional development opportunities on scientific based instruction may lead to a greater understanding of RTI and increase in campus implementation. Dulaney (2010) reported the absence of training and information as a factor that hinders the RTI implementation process. Orosco and Klingner (2010) indicated the absence of teacher training programs and intervention systems hinder the effectiveness of RTI and data-based decisions in relation to SLDs.

Qualitative Data

The participants responded to two open-ended qualitative questions regarding RTI implementation. The first question asked the participants to state what their district or

campus could do to support them with RTI. Participants cited lack of professional development (55%), time (27.5%), and curricula and personnel resources (10.3%) as barriers of proper implementation. This data suggests 92.8% of the responding participants feel they are unprepared and do not have enough time to properly implement RTI. This data further correlates to the survey results from this study that indicated time as the lowest rated factor of implementation, teachers and principals ranking their level of knowledge of scientific based instruction the lowest component, and teachers having an overall lower level of knowledge and implementation of tiered instruction in comparison to principals. To have an increased success rate when implementing any strategy or process, it is imperative that professional development provides the participant with a proficient working-knowledge of the “system” as a whole, which includes designated materials and resources. Participants suggested the following recommendations: (1) incorporate a campus universal time to service students for RTI, (2) provide adequate, on-going training, and (3) provide time for teachers to prepare and implement with fidelity.

The second question asked participants for additional comments. Participants acknowledged the necessity of RTI but again, underscored the importance of increased intervention time and resources to service individual student ability levels. In addition, participants highlighted that additional support personnel would be instrumental in servicing student groups, collecting data, and progress monitoring from year-to-year. O’Connor and Freeman (2012) indicated that principals play a key role in cultivating a positive school climate in terms of RTI implementation and encouraging communication

between all staff. Research also indicated that principals play an important role in establishing high standards, setting goals, offering a clear vision and providing individual support.

Limitations

This research study was conducted using only elementary school teachers and principals from one urban school district in North Central Texas. Since cultures and attitudes in elementary schools differ from state to state, the findings may only be generalized to geographic locations where similar attitudes and cultures exist. Therefore, this sample may not represent the true characteristics of the total population.

Major limitations of this study included limitations associated with non-experimental research designs. In particular, non-experimental designs yield results that are difficult to establish a true cause-effect relationship and extraneous variables are difficult to control. Survey research traditionally has a low response rate of return that may affect the sample integrity of the target populations. Non-experimental research is limited because it is based on information obtained at one point in time. The study is not a truly random study because participants volunteered by responding and their responses may differ from those who selected not to respond.

Future Research

Future researchers might conduct studies on methods to evaluate the success of professional development programs developed to train teachers and principals on the factors that enhance or hinder the effective implementation of the RTI process. A study conducted to compare principal and teacher demographics (gender, ethnicity, age, level

of education, route to certification, years of experience) with the level of knowledge and implementation of RTI components is recommended. Future research to examine the effects of time allotment to implement RTI is also recommended. There was a very small sample size of 44 participants. A total of 29 teachers and 15 principals participated in the survey. A follow up study with a larger sample size is recommended. Finally, research is recommended on how to evaluate the effectiveness of district supports to eliminate obstacles in the implementation of effective RTI practices to increase student achievement of all students in the general education curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Allaman, C. H. (2008). The effect of response to intervention on student achievement in selected Illinois elementary schools (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses. (3338877)
- Ball, C. R., & Trammell, B. A. (2011). Response-to-intervention in high-risk preschools: Critical issues for implementation. *Psychology in the Schools, 48*(5), 502-512.
- Bartle, H. (2009). Implementation of the response to intervention model: Perceptions of change, challenges, supports and role shifts (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses. (3360952)
- Berry, R. (2010). Preservice and early career teachers' attitudes toward inclusion, instructional accommodations, and fairness: Three profiles. *Teacher Educator, 45*(2), 75-95.
- Brinker, J. (2012). The effect of teacher collaboration and co-teaching on the response to reading intervention of elementary-aged students with learning disabilities (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Doctoral Dissertations Available from Proquest. (AAI3498434)
- Brozo, W. (2009). Response to intervention or responsive instruction? Challenges and possibilities of response to intervention for adolescent literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 53*(4), 277-281.
- Burns, M., & Riley-Tillman, T. (2009). Response to intervention and eligibility decisions: We need to wait to succeed. *Communique, 38*(1), 1.

- Burns, M. K., Egan, A. M., Kunkel, K., McComas, Peterson, M. M., Rahn, N. L., & Wilson, J. (2013) Training for generalization and maintenance in RTI implementation front loading for sustainability. *Learning Disability Research & Practice, 28*(81), 81-88.
- Burns, M. K., Scholin, S. E., Kosciolk, S., & Livingston, J. (2010). Reliability of decision-making frameworks for response to intervention for reading. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 28*(2), 102-114.
- Cadima, J., Leal, T., & Burchinal, M. (2010). The quality of teacher-student interactions: associations with first graders' academic and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of School Psychology, 48*(6), 457-482.
- Canter, A., Klotz, M. B., & Cowan, K. (2008). Response to intervention: The future for secondary schools. *Principal Leadership, 12*-15.
- Cooper-Duffy, K., Szedia, P., & Hyer, G. (2010). Teaching literacy to students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 42*(3), 30-39.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Culot, B. E. (2011). Response to intervention: The principals' role in managing, implementing, and evaluating this educational reform for students in need (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation & Theses. (3465684).
- Cutler, M. (2009). Response to intervention: A study of practices, beliefs, and procedural changes in one school district (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses. (3388989).

- Daino-Garcia, J. (2008). An investigation of staff perceptions of student intervention procedures as a pathway to response to intervention (RTI) (Doctoral Dissertation.). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses. (3376965)
- Developmental Studies Center. (2011). *Let's talk about it! Oral language-reading and writing program, mondo intervention, and a variety of practical and effective core, intervention, and supplemental solutions for the K-5 classroom*. Emeryville, CA: Developmental Studies Center.
- Dulaney, S. K. (2010). Cedar middle school's response to intervention journey: A systematic, multi-tier, problem-solving approach to program implementation (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses.
- Dyson, L. (2010). Unanticipated effects of children with learning disabilities on their families. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 33(1), 43-55.
- Ehren, B. J., Ehren, T. C., & Proly, J. L. (2009). *Response to intervention: An action guide for school leaders*. Alexandria, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Eversole, T. (2010). Wisconsin response to intervention a guiding document. *Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction*. Madison, WI. Retrieved from <http://dpi.wi.gov/rti/pdf/rti-guiding-doc.pdf>
- Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G. S. (2011). *The continuum of literacy learning, grades prek-8: A guide to teaching* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fuchs, D., & Deshler, D. D. (2007). What we need to know about responsiveness to intervention (and shouldn't be afraid to ask). *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 22, 129–136.

- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., & Stecker, P. M. (2010). The “blurring” of special education in a new continuum of general education placements and services. *Exceptional Children, 76*(3), 301-323.
- Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P. L., & Young, C. L. (2003). Responsiveness-to-Intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disabilities construct. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18*(3), 157-171.
- Gersten, R., & Dimino, J. A. (2011). RTI: Rethinking special education for students with reading difficulties (yet again). *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(1), 99-108.
- Glover, T. A., & DiPerna, J. C. (2007). Service delivery for response to intervention: Core components and directions for future research. *School Psychology Review, 36*(4), 526-540.
- Greenfield, R., Rinaldi, C., Proctor, C., & Cardarelli, A. (2010). Teachers' perceptions of a response to intervention (RTI) reform effort in an urban elementary school: A consensual qualitative analysis. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 21*(1), 47-63.
- Hagans, K. S. (2008). A response to intervention approach to decreasing early literacy differences in first graders from different socioeconomic backgrounds: Evidence for the intervention validity of the DIBELS. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 34* (35), 35- 32.
- Hardman, M., & Dawson, S. (2008). The impact of federal public policy on curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities in the general classroom. *Preventing School Failure, 52*(2), 5-11.

- Harvey, M., Yssel, N., Bauserman, A., & Merbler, J. (2010). Preservice teacher preparation for inclusion: An exploration of higher education teacher-training institutions. *Remedial and Special Education, 31*(1), 24-33.
- Hill, D. R., King, S. A. Lemons, C. J., & Partanen, J. N. (2012). Fidelity of implementation and instructional alignment in response to intervention research. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 27*(3), 116-124.
- Hoover, J., & Love, E., (2011). Supporting school-based response to intervention: A practitioner's model. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 43*(3), 40-48.
- Hosp, M., Hosp, J., & Howell, K. (2007). *The ABC's o/CBM' A practical guide to curriculum based measurement*. New York: Guilford Press. Hoover, J., & Love, E., (2011). Supporting school-based response to intervention: A practitioner's model. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 43*(3), 40-48.
- Hughes, C., & Dexter, D. (2011). Response to Intervention: A research-based summary. *Theory into Practice, 50*, 4-11.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, 1 U.S.C.A. § 614. United States Department of Education, Retrieved from <http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cdynamic%2CTopicalBrief%2C23%2C>.
- Johnson, E., Mellard, D. F., Fuchs, D., & McKnight, M. A. (2006). Responsiveness to intervention (RTI): How to do it. Lawrence, KS: National Research Center on Learning Disabilities.

- Johnston, P. (2010). An instructional frame for RTI. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(7),602-604.
- Jones, R. E., & Ball, C. R. (2012). Introduction to the special issue: Addressing response to intervention implementation: Questions from the field. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(3), 207–209.
- Keogh, B. (2007). Celebrating PL 94-142: The Education of all handicapped children act of 1975. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 16(2), 6S-69.
- Lembke, E., Garman, C., Deno, S., & Stecker, P. (2010). One elementary school's 115 implementation of response to intervention (RTI). *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 26(4), 361-373.
- Longmore, P. (2009). Making disability an essential part of American history. *OAH Magazine of History*, 23(3), 11.
- Machek, G., & Nelson, J. (2010). School psychologists' perceptions regarding the practice of identifying reading disabilities: Cognitive assessment and response to intervention considerations. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(3), 230-24S.
- Maier, M. P., Pate, J. L., Gibson, N. M., Hilgert, L., Hull, K., & Campbell, P. C. (2016) A quantitative examination of school leadership and response to intervention. *Learning Disability Research & Practice*, 31(2), 103-112.
- Martinez, R. & Young, A. (2011). Response to intervention: How is it practiced and perceived? *International Journal of Special Education*, 26(1), 44-52.

- May, K. (2009). By reason thereof: Causation and eligibility under the individuals with disabilities education act. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, 2009(1), 173-195.
- Mellard, D., McKnight, M., & Jordan, J. (2010). RTI tier structures and instructional intensity. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 25(4), 217-225.
- Milosovic, S. (2007). Building a case against scripted reading programs. *Education Digest*, 7 (1), 27-30.
- Moore, E. (2009). Decision making processes to promote inclusive environments for students with disabilities. *Catalyst or Change*, 36(1), 13-22.
- Moors, A., Weisenburgh-Snyder, A., & Robbins, J. (2010). Integrating frequency-based mathematics instruction with a multi-level assessment system to enhance response to intervention frameworks. *Behavior Analyst Today*, 11(4), 226-244.
- National Center on Response to Intervention. (2017). How Can We Ensure RTI Works? Lessons Learned From Research and Recommendations for Practice. Retrieved from <https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/How%20Can%20We%20Ensure%20Response%20to%20Intervention%20Works.pdf>.
- Northouse, P. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Nunn, G. D., Jantz, P. B., & Butikofer, C. (2009). Concurrent validity between teacher efficacy and perceptions of response to intervention outcomes. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 36(3), 215-218.
- O'Connor, E. P., & Freeman, E. W. (2012). District-level considerations in supporting and sustaining RTI implementation. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(3), 297-310.

- Ockerman, M., Mason, E., & Hollenbeck, A. (2012). Integrating RTI with school counseling programs: Being a proactive professional school counselor. *Journal of School Counseling, 10*(15), 1-37.
- Orosco, M. J., & Klingner, J. (2010). One school's implementation of RTI with English language learners: "Referring into RTI". *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 43*(3), 269-288.
- Palenchar, L. M. (2012). A study of west Virginia elementary special education teachers' roles, responsibilities, and practices within a multitiered instructional support system: Implications for policy and practice (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Theses, Dissertations, & Capstones. (Paper 212)
- Response to Intervention: An IDEA partnership collection (n.d.). Retrieved April 12, 2010 from www.ideapartnership.org
- Rinaldi, C., Averill, O., & Stuart, S. (2011). Response to Intervention: Educators' perceptions of a three-year RTI collaborative reform effort in an urban elementary school. *Journal of Education, 191*(2), 43-53.
- Robinson, G., Bursuck, W., & Sinclair, K. (2013). Implementing RTI in two rural elementary schools: Encouraging beginnings and challenges for the future. *Rural Educator, 34*(3), 1– 9.
- Rodriguez, N. (2010). Leading Change transforming doubters into believers. *Leadership, 40*(2), 12-16.

- Ryan, T., Kaffenberger, C., & Carroll, A. (2011). Response to intervention: An opportunity for school counselor leadership. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(3), 211-221.
- Sansosti, F., Noltemeyer, A., & Goss, S. (2010). Principals' perceptions of the importance and availability of response to intervention practices within high school settings. *School Psychology Review, 39*(2), 286-295.
- Sansosti, F., Telzrow, C., & Noltemeyer, A. (2010). Barriers and facilitators to implementing response to intervention in secondary schools: Qualitative perspectives in school psychology. *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice, 4*(1), 1-21.
- Scott, T. D. (2010). The effectiveness of the response-to-intervention process or at-risk high school students (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Doctoral Dissertations & Theses. (3387848)
- Shepherd, K., & Salembier, G., (2011). Improving schools through a response to intervention approach: A cross-case analysis of three rural schools. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 30*(3), 3–15.
- Shirvani, H. (2009). Does the No Child Left Behind Act leave some children behind? *International Journal of Learning, 16*(3),49-57.
- Shores, C. (Ed.). (2012). *The best of corwin: Response to intervention*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Skinner, C. H., McCleary, D. F., Skolits, G. L., Poncy, B. C., & Cates, G. L. (2013). Emerging opportunities for school psychologist to enhance our remediation

- procedure evidence base as we apply response to intervention. *Psychology in the Schools*, 50(3), 272-289.
- Spanneut, G., Tobin, J., & Ayers, S. (2012). Identifying the professional development needs of public school principals based on the interstate school leaders licensure consortium standards. *NASSP Bulletin*, 96(1), 67-88.
- Stetter, M., & Hughes, M. (2010). Using story grammar to assist students with learning disabilities and reading difficulties improve their comprehension. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 33(1), 115-151.
- Swanson, E., Solis, M., Ciullo, S., & McKenna, J. (2012). Special education teachers' perceptions and instructional practices in response to intervention implementation. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 35(2), 115-126.
- Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. *Teacher College Record*, 112(1), 331-373.
- Thomas, L. B., & Zirkel, P. A., (2010). State laws for RtI: An updated snapshot. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 24(3), 56-63.
- Tubpun, T. (2013). General education and special education teachers' beliefs and perceptions of skills for response to intervention (RTI) (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses. (3780321)
- Turnbull III, H. (2009). A modest proposal in four parts. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 42(1), 1-10.

- Unruh, S. & McKeller, N. A. (2013). Evolution, not revolution: School Psychologists' changing practices in determine specific learning disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*(4), 353-365.
- Werts, M. G., Carpenter, E. S., & Fewell, C. (2014). Barriers and benefits to response to intervention: Perceptions of special education teachers. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 33*(2), 3–11.
- White, R. B., Polly, D., & Audette, R. H. (2012). A case analysis of an elementary school's implementation of 121 response to intervention. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 26*(1), 73–90.
- Wright, R. J., Ellemor-Collins, D., & Tabor, P. D. (2012). *Developing numbers: Assessment, teaching, and intervention with 7-11 year olds*. London: SAGE.

APPENDIX A
LETTER OF APPROVAL

Letter of Approval from the Executive Director of Elementary Leadership

Executive Director of Elementary Leadership
Independent School District

Date: September 5, 2018
To: Paula Brooks
From: Executive Director of Elementary Leadership
Re: Request for External Research

This memo is in response to your request to conduct research with _ ISD. After reviewing your appeal, I am pleased to inform you that your study, Elementary Teachers' and Principals' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention, has been approved.

You are free to begin your study. You agree to keep all data confidential which includes creating special subject numbers, keeping data safeguarded, not sharing or reporting individual data to third parties for research or other purposes, and using the data only for agreed upon research and program development purposes. You understand and agree that no confidential information regarding any principals, teachers, or students will be disclosed in any document intended for public disclosure.

Although this memo constitutes approval from _ Independent School District's Elementary Leadership Department, you must have principal consent before you can start your study. Principal and teacher participation is strictly voluntary.

Please send us results and/or publications resulting from your study. I wish you the best in conducting your study at _ Independent School District. Let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Executive Director of Elementary Leadership

Approved:

CC:

APPENDIX B
IRB APPROVAL LETTER

Letter of Approval from the Institutional Review Board



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
P.O. Box 425619, Denton, TX 76204-5619
940-898-3378
email: IRB@twu.edu
<https://www.twu.edu/institutional-review-board-irb/>

DATE: January 15, 2019

TO: Ms. Paula Brooks
Teacher Education

FROM: Institutional Review Board (IRB) - Denton

Re: *Approval for Elementary Teachers' and Principals' Reporting of Factors that Impact the Implementation of Response to Intervention (Protocol #: 20303)*

The above referenced study has been reviewed and approved by the Denton IRB (operating under FWA00000178) on 1/14/2019 using an expedited review procedure. This approval is valid for one year and expires on 1/14/2020. The IRB will send an email notification 45 days prior to the expiration date with instructions to extend or close the study. It is your responsibility to request an extension for the study if it is not yet complete, to close the protocol file when the study is complete, and to make certain that the study is not conducted beyond the expiration date.

If applicable, agency approval letters must be submitted to the IRB upon receipt prior to any data collection at that agency. A request to close this study must be filed with the Institutional Review Board at the completion of the study. Because you do not utilize a signed consent form for your study, the filing of signatures of subjects with the IRB is not required.

Any modifications to this study must be submitted for review to the IRB using the Modification Request Form. Additionally, the IRB must be notified immediately of any adverse events or unanticipated problems. All forms are located on the IRB website. If you have any questions, please contact the TWU IRB.

cc. Dr. Diane Myers, Teacher Education
Dr. Jane Pemberton, Teacher Education
Graduate School

APPENDIX C

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EMAIL

Appendix C – Recruitment Email to Principals and Teachers

Dear principal or teacher,

I am currently working on my doctoral degree in the area of Special Education at Texas Woman's University. As a part of my doctoral dissertation, I am hoping to conduct an online survey of elementary teachers' and principals' perceptions of their level of knowledge of the Response to Intervention (RTI) process. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to determine factors that impact the level of implementation of the RTI process on the elementary campus. As an employee of Crowley Independent School District, you are invited to participate in this research.

If you agree to participate in the research, please complete the online survey by clicking on the link at the bottom of this page. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The findings will help the researchers understand factors that impact the level of implementation of the RTI process on the elementary campus.

The survey has been designed so that you can complete it easily. Your participation in this study is completely up to you. If you begin the survey, you can stop anytime without question or penalty. Only completed surveys will be used for the study. There is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, electronic meetings, and internet transactions.

You can start the survey by clicking on this link:

<https://www.psychdata.com/s.asp?SID=184786>

<https://goo.gl/forms/h0C2E8qxGojQkTxV2>

If you have any questions about the research study, you may contact me or my advisor, Jane Pemberton, PhD, at:

Paula
Brooks
pdouglas@twu.edu
469-278-5113

Jane Pemberton, PhD
jpemberton@twu.edu
940-898-2218

Once again, thank you so much for your participation in this study.
Paula Brooks

APPENDIX D

SURVEY

Online Survey

THE RETURN OF YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTITUTES YOUR INFORMED CONSENT TO ACT AS A PARTICIPANT IN THIS RESEARCH.

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS' REPORTING OF FACTORS THAT IMPACT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

This survey focuses on elementary teachers' and principals' perceptions of factors that enhance or hinder Response to Intervention (RTI) practices, and the extent Response to Intervention practices are being implemented on their campus.

Section I. Participant Demographics																
Directions: Please answer the following questions by placing a check mark or written response on the lines provided.																
Gender:					Ethnicity:											
<input type="checkbox"/>	Male				<input type="checkbox"/>	Caucasian			<input type="checkbox"/>	Hispanic						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Female				<input type="checkbox"/>	African American			<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian/Pacific Islander						
					<input type="checkbox"/>	American Indian			<input type="checkbox"/>	Other						
Age:	<input type="checkbox"/>	20 - 29			<input type="checkbox"/>	30 - 39		<input type="checkbox"/>	40 - 49		<input type="checkbox"/>	50 - 59		<input type="checkbox"/>	60+	
Level of Education:				Route to Teacher Certification:				Route to Administrator Certification:								
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bachelor's				<input type="checkbox"/>	University Based				<input type="checkbox"/>	University Based					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Master's				<input type="checkbox"/>	Alternative Certification				<input type="checkbox"/>	Alternative Certification					
<input type="checkbox"/>	Doctorate															
Total years general education teacher experience: _____						Total years general education teacher experience in current district: _____										
Total years special education teacher experience: _____						Total years special education teacher experience in current district: _____										
Total years as a principal and/or assistant principal: _____						Total years as a principal and/or assistant principal in current district: _____										
Number of days of professional development on Response to Intervention you received in the past 3 school years? <i>Please check one box only</i>																
<input type="checkbox"/>	None		<input type="checkbox"/>	0 days (1-3 hours)		<input type="checkbox"/>	1 day (4-6 hours)		<input type="checkbox"/>	2-3 days (7-18 hours)		<input type="checkbox"/>	3+ days (more than 18 hours)			
Section II. School Demographics																
Are you at a Title 1 campus?				<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>	No		If yes, approximate percentage of economically disadvantaged students: ____						
Approximate total number of students in your building:																

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS' REPORTING OF FACTORS THAT IMPACT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

Section III. Survey Questions on Response To Intervention Practices

Directions: Read the definition for each of the following RTI components. For the first statement below each definition, indicate your level of knowledge about the practice. For the second statement, indicate what you observe to be the level of implementation of that practice on your campus. For the third statement, indicate the availability of materials on your campus needed to implement that practice. For the fourth statement, indicate the amount of time you have in order to implement that practice. Please indicate your response to each statement by placing a check in the box.

Statement Responses:	Limited	Somewhat Limited	Moderate	Somewhat Extensive	Extensive
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
My overall level of knowledge of the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Universal Screening the first step in identifying the students who are at risk for learning difficulties

1. My level of knowledge on the use of Universal Screening in the RTI process is effective for identifying students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. I know how to implement Universal Screening in the RTI process to identify students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. I have the needed materials for the implementation of Universal Screening in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I have the necessary time for the implementation of Universal Screening in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Statement Responses:	Limited <u>1</u>	Somewhat Limited <u>2</u>	Moderate <u>3</u>	Somewhat Extensive <u>4</u>	Extensive <u>5</u>
Tiered Instruction a model in which the instruction delivered to students varies on several dimensions that are related to the nature and severity of the student's difficulties					
5. My level of knowledge on the use of Tiered Instruction in the RTI process is effective for identifying students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. I know how to implement Tiered Instruction in the RTI process to identify students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. I have the needed materials for the implementation of Tiered Instruction in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. I have the necessary time for the implementation of Tiered Instruction in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scientific Based instruction an instructional program or collection of practices tested and shown to have a record of success					
9. My level of knowledge on the use of Scientific Based instruction in the RTI process is effective for identifying students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. I know how to implement Scientific Based instruction in the RTI process to identify students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. I have the needed materials for the implementation of Scientific Based instruction in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. I have the necessary time for the implementation of Scientific Based instruction in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Statement Responses:	Limited <u>1</u>	Somewhat Limited <u>2</u>	Moderate <u>3</u>	Somewhat Extensive <u>4</u>	Extensive <u>5</u>
Progress Monitoring is an ongoing approach for measuring the growth of student proficiency in the core educational skills (reading, writing, and arithmetic).					
13. My level of knowledge on the use of Progress Monitoring in the RTI process is effective for identifying students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. I know how to implement Progress Monitoring in the RTI process to identify students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. I have the needed materials for the implementation of Progress Monitoring in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. I have the necessary time for the implementation of Progress Monitoring in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data Analysis is the use of data collection to make instructional decisions based on assessment data.					
17. My level of knowledge on the use of Data Analysis in the RTI process is effective for identifying students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. I know how to implement Data Analysis in the RTI process to identify students at-risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. I have the needed materials for the implementation of Data Analysis in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. I have the necessary time for the implementation of Data Analysis in the RTI process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS' REPORTING OF FACTORS THAT IMPACT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

Section IV. Open-Ended Questions

Please take time to reflect on your level of knowledge and implementation of Response to Intervention practices used with students on your campus. Then, write your responses in the space provided.

21. What could your district or campus do to support you with Response to Intervention?

22. Additional comments:

Responses are confidential; there is no place on survey for participants' names. Participation is voluntary and participants can withdraw participation at any time. *There is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, and Internet transactions.*
