Self-Assessment of Problem Solving Implementation (SAPSI)*

School-Based Leadership Team Members (Name & Position)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Person(s) Completing Report (Name & Position)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response
to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

PS/RtI Implementation Assessment

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

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

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

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

Additional Comments/Evidence:

_____

_____

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont'd)

Scale: **N**ot Started (***N***) — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
In Progress (***I***) — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
Achieved (***A)*** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
Maintaining (***M***) — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

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

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont'd)

Scale: **N**ot Started (***N***) — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
In Progress (***I***) — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
Achieved (***A)*** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
Maintaining (***M***) — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

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

Additional Comments/Evidence:

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont'd)

Scale: **N**ot Started (***N***) — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
In Progress (***I***) — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
Achieved (***A)*** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
Maintaining (***M***) — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

Implementation: ***Three-Tiered Intervention System and Problem-Solving Process***	**Status**	**Comments/Evidence**
21. The school has established a three-tiered system of service delivery.		
a. Tier 1 Academic Core Instruction clearly identified.		
b. Tier 1 Behavioral Core Instruction clearly identified.		
c. Tier 2 Academic Supplemental Instruction/Programs clearly identified.		
d. Tier 2 Behavioral Supplemental Instruction/Programs clearly identified.		
e. Tier 3 Academic Intensive Strategies/Programs are evidence-based.		
f. Tier 3 Behavioral Intensive Strategies/Programs are evidence-based.		
22. Teams (e.g., School-Based Leadership Team, Problem-Solving Team, Intervention Assistance Team) implement effective problem solving procedures including:		
a. Problem is defined as a data-based discrepancy (GAP Analysis) between what is expected and what is occurring (includes peer and benchmark data).		
b. Replacement behaviors (e.g., reading performance targets, homework completion targets) are clearly defined.		
c. Problem analysis is conducted using available data and evidence-based hypotheses.		
d. Intervention plans include evidence-based (e.g., research-based, data-based) strategies.		
e. Intervention support personnel are identified and scheduled for all interventions.		

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont'd)

Scale: **N**ot Started (***N***) — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
In Progress (***I***) — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
Achieved (***A)*** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
Maintaining (***M***) — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

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

Additional Comments/Evidence:

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

PS/RtI Implementation Assessment (Cont'd)

Scale: **N**ot Started (***N***) — (The activity occurs less than 24% of the time)
In Progress (***I***) — (The activity occurs approximately 25% to 74% of the time)
Achieved (***A)*** — (The activity occurs approximately 75% to 100% of the time)
Maintaining (***M***) — (The activity was rated as achieved last time and continues to occur approximately 75% to 100% of the time)

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

Additional Comments/Evidence:

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

Copyright © 2008 by the Florida Problem-Solving/Response to Intervention Project. All rights reserved. Used with permission.