ABSTRACT

Title of Document:        A STUDY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL
                         CONSULTATION TEAM FACILITATOR ROLE

                         Megan Michelle Vaganek, Doctor of Philosophy,
                         2015

Directed By:             Professor Emerita Dr. Sylvia Rosenfield
                         Department of Counseling, Higher Education, and
                         Special Education

Consultation teams have been used in schools as a vehicle for increasing student

performance and teacher skills. Like other evidence-based interventions,

consultee-centered consultation models require attention to the complex process

of implementation in order for one to expect results.  The IC Facilitator is a key

factor in the successful implementation of IC Teams. The purpose of the current

research is to expand upon a previous interview study and other research on

facilitators.  The skills, beliefs and characteristics of other team facilitators and

implementers of innovations have influenced implementation in a variety of

contexts Using a survey, the study assessed the perceived importance and the

changeability through training and experience of the beliefs, knowledge,

facilitator characteristics, tasks and implementation skills of IC Team Facilitators.

The beliefs, characteristics, and skills included in the study have been shown to

have a relationship with implementation and leadership in other fields and lines of

research. Chi square tests of independence explored differences in rating patterns

between groups of facilitators based on training and experience. No significant

group differences were found between novice and veteran facilitators or between those who led teams through phase 2 or phase 3 of implementation. Supplemental analyses explored the demographics of the respondents and the beliefs, knowledge, skills, tasks, and characteristics considered essential to the job. Items rated as essential by a majority of participants were presented. The study has implications for improving and enhancing training and selection of facilitators in order to improve implementation and utilization of Instructional Consultation Teams. Limitations included the response rate to the survey, and considerations for the statistical analysis. Future directions were addressed including exploring associations between item importance and outcomes, such as turnover, utilization, and level of implementation. Future research may also address the relationship between rating of importance and competence and training methods to best teach the essentials. Other research methodology, such as observations and rank ordering skills may provide additional information about the facilitator role.

A STUDY OF  THE INSTRUCTIONAL CONSULTATION TEAM FACILITATOR
ROLE


By


Megan Michelle Vaganek


Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of
Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2015

Advisory Committee:
Professor Emerita Sylvia Rosenfield, Chair
Professor Emeritus William Strein
Professor Jeffrey Harring
Dr. Deborah Nelson
Professor Linda Valli, Dean's Representative

**Acknowledgements**

To Dr. Sylvia Rosenfield, thank you for your support and guidance throughout my graduate career. Your advice and encouragement were essential for me to reach this milestone. Your teaching also guides my practice every day to do the best I can for children, families, and teachers.

To my committee and IC Teams experts, thank you for your guidance and feedback. I appreciate your time and assistance so very much. Thank you to the IC Teams facilitators who have shared their insights with me over the years.

To my family, thank you for your unwavering support and presence. Thank you for believing in me at each step of the way and for helping me over each hurdle. This achievement is both for you and because of you. A special thank you to my husband for taking on so much while I sprinted to the finish line. To my friends and cohort, I could not have made it through years of coursework, practicums and research without your constant support. I am so proud to call you my colleagues.

List of Tables

**Chapter 1: The Instructional Consultation Facilitator: A Key to Implementation**

Extensive time, money, and effort have been spent by researchers and school districts in order to develop and apply evidence-based interventions (EBIs) and prevention programs to address all manners of academic, behavioral, and social concerns in schools (Foreman et al., 2013). Over the years, researchers and practitioners alike have found that, despite the evidence available for a given program or intervention, similar results are not guaranteed outside of a controlled research setting. It is plausible to suggest that similar results are unlikely in the field unless great attention is paid to fidelity of implementation (Fixen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005; Forman, 2009). Practitioners and university researchers recognize that one of the greatest challenges faced by schools is successfully implementing and institutionalizing innovations (Fixen et al., 2005; Nelson, Aux, Neall, & Gravois, 2009).

Implementation is a complex process and set of activities that occurs in stages, setting into motion a program or practice in a particular context, for a particular population (Forman, 2009; Forman et al., 2013). In the past, it was assumed that implementation would happen automatically if information about a high-quality intervention were made available (Fixen et al., 2005; Forman, 2009). According to Forman et al. (2013), specific implementation steps and intervention activities are needed for an EBI to actually take place. Intervention activities are the actions taken to deliver the intervention to the client (e.g., student or teacher) in a real-life setting, such as drumming up support from stakeholders, gathering resources, and providing information (Foreman et al., 2013). The growing field of implementation science, as it specifically applies to education, implores researchers and practitioners to understand and address the

barriers and supports of EBIs in order to increase the use and effectiveness of interventions (Foreman et al., 2013).

**The Role of the Facilitator**

The implementation literature (e.g., Fixen et al., 2005) indicates that someone must be responsible for carrying out implementation activities. A better understanding of those responsible for implementation may yield fruitful information for stakeholders trying to affect outcomes for students and teachers. Within the context of school improvement, school change, and the implementation of new innovations, the literature on leadership in schools focuses primarily on principals (e.g., Hall & Hord, 2006; Huberman & Miles, 1984). However, other individuals, termed change agents or facilitators, can also be responsible for school improvement and program implementation (Fullan, 2001; Hord, Stiegelbauer, & Hall, 1984). Along with the principal, facilitators play a role in achieving global, systemic change in schools (Fullan, 2001 Hall & Hord, 1984; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). One critical component for implementation of effective interventions is choosing the right staff to lead the change. According to Fixen et al. (2005), staff selection is an implementation-driver, at both the practitioner and organizational levels that is expected to have an impact on intervention outcomes.

Research on facilitators is important because the facilitator or change agent has considerable influence over adoption and implementation of programs (Fullan, 2001; Rodgers, 2003). This connection is also assumed in the case of Instructional Consultation Teams, as the facilitator bears considerable responsibility for training and managing the program. Facilitator selection and retention may have a significant influence on implementation, and therefore effectiveness. Berger et al. (2014) looked at

utilization of IC teams and included facilitator stability as a related factor. Results indicated that facilitator stability was related to two measures of IC Teams utilization. Despite the presumed importance, Fixen et al. (2005) reports that staff selection is a neglected area of implementation research.

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of one type of change facilitator, whose selection and training is of critical importance to the implementation of IC Teams (Rosenfield, 2014; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). In the case of IC Teams, a consultee-centered consultation model aimed at increasing teacher and student outcomes, the IC Team facilitator is the school-based implementer. In conducting that role, the IC Team facilitator is responsible for training the team and managing the problem-solving model. Therefore, it is critical to better understand the facilitator role on implementing problem solving teams for the purpose of training and selection.

**School-Based Problem Solving Teams**

Schools and education policy-makers have long recognized the need for tools to increase student achievement. Problem-solving and multi-disciplinary decision-making teams are one vehicle that has been recommended, and in some cases, mandated, in order to help educators to identify, implement, adapt, and sustain effective and evidenced-based practices (Truscott et al., 2012). In addition to determining special education eligibility and designing individualized education plans (IEPs), teams have been adapted to serve a variety of purposes in schools, including pre-referral teams focused on consultation, instructional support, intervention, and professional development (Iverson, 2002; Kovaleski, 2002; Rosenfield & Humphrey, 2012). Teams that provide consultation to

teachers and staff, specifically, can act as a translator of research to practice in the schools (Gravois, 2012).

Despite the widespread establishment of teams in schools across the country, team practices are not usually built on evidence and members are typically provided little or no training in group process (Iverson, 2002). In a review of the literature from 99 peer-reviewed journals between 1980 and 1997, Welch, Brownell and Sheridan (1999) found that only 18 articles had been published on school-based problem-solving teams and only one-third of those articles reported on empirical research.  Practical issues and advice about training and practice have appeared in the literature (e.g., Kovaleski, 2002) and studies on IC teams, described below, provide some information about the skills of the team leader.

The gaps in the evidence base for team practices are exacerbated by the lack of attention in the literature to the implementation of these teams. To see results, schools must choose appropriate programs and practices for their specific populations and fully implement with fidelity.  In addition, attention must be paid to those responsible for implementation and intervention activities, so that schools can best recruit and train staff to maximize outcomes.

**Research on the General Facilitator Role**

Facilitation and leadership research, as well as research on teams, is more frequently found in the management and psychology literature (DeChurch, Hiller, Murase, Doty, & Salas, 2010) than in education, despite the increased use of facilitation for change agents in schools.  Thomas (2004) remarked that literature on facilitators focuses on the skills, methods, models or theories of facilitation, but neglects the

assumptions and philosophies behind the processes through which facilitators develop. Thomas (2004) reviewed facilitator literature across a number of fields and classified the approach to facilitator education based on the rationale for action in facilitation. Facilitator education approaches can be categorized as follows:

- Approaches with a narrow focus on skills and formulaic approaches

- Approaches grounded in theory

- Approaches that emphasize the motives behind actions and personal qualities necessary for the facilitator

- Approaches and education programs that raise awareness of the political nature and implications of facilitation

Although some work has been done to better understand the facilitator, Thomas states that the literature is weak and only a small portion is grounded in empirical evidence. He suggests that the use of naturalistic approaches would strengthen the available knowledge about facilitation.

The IC Teams facilitator as leader provides another framework through which to think about the role. Leadership literature focuses on several levels, from lower-level team and unit leaders, to middle management and top-level, executive leadership. According to Morgeson, DeRue, and Karam (2010), a key aspect of team leadership is oriented around meeting team needs. Leaders can be internal or external and the formality of the leadership role is on a continuum. In general, teams that lack effective leadership are characterized by greater conflict, low motivation, ineffective decision-making, and poor implementation (Emshoff et al., 2003; Feinburg, Kim, & Greenburg,

2008). Style and competence of the facilitator is considered an important determinant of team functioning (Knupfer, Turner, Hopkins, & Librett, 1993).

**Instructional Consultation (IC) Teams**

Instructional Consultation (IC) is a consultee-centered consultation model, primarily delivered through a school-based team format that provides assistance to teachers with academic or behavioral concerns for students (Rosenfield, 2014). IC occurs within a team format; however the referring teachers work with an individual member of the team trained in the problem-solving process, called the case manager. The goal of IC Teams is to improve student achievement in the general education environment by supporting teachers' capacity to use assessments, collect data, and employ instructional practices that are based on evidence (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). Three critical assumptions underlie the IC Teams model: (a) all children can learn under the right conditions, (b) focus must be on the match between a student's skills with the task and instruction, and (c) a problem-solving, collaborative school community is beneficial. These assumptions suggest that student success can be enhanced through teacher professional development and collaboration.

The IC model has a systematic training and implementation process with a series of training sessions and coaching opportunities provided by IC staff (Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling, 2002; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). Training and implementation of IC Teams occurs in three phases, with the designated school-based IC Facilitator taking the most prominent role (Gravois, Gickling, & Rosenfield, 2007). Phase 1 focuses on introducing the school to IC Teams and the development of facilitator skills in Instructional Assessment and IC. Potential team members are identified in Phase 1.

During phase 2, the facilitator leads the development and implementation of the team. Continued implementation, maintenance and evaluation take place in Phase 3. In this phase, the facilitator has the opportunity to receive advanced training to become an Approved IC Team Trainer. The phases overlap and are intended to be completed in two to three years. A four-year experimental investigation of the effectiveness of IC Teams (Rosenfield & Gottfredson, 2004) revealed several avenues for deeper examination of the implementation of IC Teams. During the four years of on-going training, support and contact with university researchers and IC staff, the implementation role of IC facilitators was reiterated (e.g. Berger et al., 2012; Neall & Cassata, 2009).

**The IC Teams Facilitator Role**

The IC Team Facilitator bears much of the responsibility for implementation, as he or she must develop the team and facilitate service delivery through ongoing team-member training, coaching, and collaboration with building and district administrators. Team leadership is one component of the IC Facilitator role. The IC Facilitators are internal leaders, with a high degree of formality to the role, as they are appointed by the school and receive additional training above and beyond that received by team members. The major facilitator activities outlined in the IC Teams Facilitator Training Manual (Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling, 2002) include:

- Planning and conducting team meetings
- Coaching team members
- Modeling the collaborative consultation process
- Receiving external support and training
- Consulting with the principal

- Disseminating information to staff about the IC Team

- Assisting with program evaluation

The facilitator also functions as an active team member, taking cases with teachers who have a concern regarding the academic progress or behavior of a student, small group or their class as a whole (Rosenfield, 2014). Burkhouse (2012) investigated the core competencies of consultants. Given that one central task of the IC facilitator is to engage in case management, the important and trainable tasks of the consultants would likely overlap with those of the facilitator. Vaganek (2012) found that facilitators reported several case management skills and tasks as critical to the role. Burkhouse found that the top four consultant competencies were capacity to form quality relationships, trustworthiness, perspective-taking skills and acting as a reflective practitioner. These competencies are closely related to the skills identified in IC Teams literature and confirmed as important to the role in other research on the facilitator (e.g. McMahon, 1998; Vaganek; 2012).

According to Nelson, Aux, Neall, and Gravois (2009), one of the greatest challenges of implementing IC Teams at the school level is defining the role of the IC facilitator. The IC Facilitator is unlike other traditional roles found in schools (Nelson et al., 2009). The facilitator lacks a peer group of teachers and the legitimate authority of administrators. The facilitators must manage their own needs, skills, and schedule in order to carry out the implementation of IC Teams. A better understanding of the facilitator role and the skills, characteristics and beliefs associated with it is critical for improving IC Teams implementation.

**Current Study and Research Questions**

Research on facilitation and team leadership is important, especially when the team may be responsible for being the translator of research to practice in schools (Gravois, 2012), helping under-achieving students, or assisting teachers in learning new assessment and intervention tools. In the case of IC Teams, the facilitator is one of the key personnel for implementation integrity.

The evidence that the role of facilitator is variable, according to the facilitators' comments on their own internal survey (Neall & Cassata, 2009), and the finding that turnover in the program may be an important factor in use (Berger et al., 2014), point to the potential usefulness of further study of the IC Facilitator role. As stated above, the IC Facilitator is expected to play a critical role in the implementation of IC Teams. IC Teams program developers (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996) indicate that personal traits and interpersonal skills are expected to be relevant to the IC Facilitator's ability to carry out their role as leader and trainer. Some research has been conducted on the perceived tasks, knowledge, skill, and abilities (KSAs), and beliefs related to the role (Vaganek, 2012), as well as the perceived importance and frequency of use of facilitator skills (McMahon, 1998; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996).

The following study was designed to extend the understanding of the role of the IC Facilitator. Based on the literature on team facilitation, research specific to the IC Facilitator, and IC training documentation (McMahon, 1998; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012), the following research questions are addressed:

- What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs, knowledge, abilities, skills, tasks, and characteristics reported in previous studies

as related to the IC Team facilitator role (e.g. McMahnon, 1998; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012) as not important, important, or essential?

- What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs, and characteristics related to the IC Team facilitator role as not at all changeable, somewhat changeable or very changeable by training and experience?

- Do IC Facilitators' ratings of importance and changeability differ significantly by phase of implementation completed by the facilitators or years of experience as a facilitator?

**Definitions of Terms**

*Beliefs* describe the values and assumptions facilitators in previous studies reported are important to the role.

*Instructional Consultation (IC) Teams Facilitator* is the team leader of the schools IC Team. Facilitators play a critical role in the implementation of interventions and innovations and this is also true in IC Teams. The IC facilitator is responsible for training and disseminating the intervention (Fullan, 2001; Hord, Stiegelbauer, & Hall, 1984; Rodgers, 2003; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Rosenfield, 2014).

*Facilitator Characteristics and Abilities* are the personal traits and attributes reported as important to the role, including implementation skills, interpersonal skills, and personal attributes.

*Knowledge* describes information and ideas that the job incumbent needs in order to get his or her work done (Fine & Cronshaw, 1999).

*Skills* are acquired competencies one must have in order to carry out tasks (Fine & Cronshaw, 1999). Skills range from simple to complex*.*

*Tasks* are discrete actions, with a beginning and end, that when carried out over time, contribute to a specific end result or the accomplishment of an objective (Fine, Fine, & Getkate, 1995; Fine & Cronshaw, 1988; Gael, 1983; McCormick, 1979).

*Phases of Implementation* (Gravois et al., 2007)

*Phase 1*: The focus is on introducing the school to IC Teams and the development of facilitator skills in Instructional Assessment and IC. Potential team members are identified in Phase 1.

*Phase 2*: In this phase the facilitator leads the development and implementation of the team.

*Phase 3*: Continued implementation, maintenance and evaluation take place this phase. The facilitator has the opportunity to receive advanced training to become an Approved IC Team Trainer.  The phases overlap and are intended to be completed in two to three years.

**Chapter 2:  Review of Literature**

The purpose of Chapter 2 is to explore existing research and literature on the role of the IC facilitator and the influence of facilitator characteristics on implementation of an innovation.  First the influences of facilitator characteristics and beliefs on implementation are presented, followed by a description of research on team facilitation and implementation from a variety of fields. Next the skills and tasks of the IC Facilitator are discussed and existing research on the IC facilitator is described.  Finally, a review of the core competencies for consultants is reported, as consultation is a key facet of the IC facilitator role.

## Facilitator Characteristics

Many characteristics of team facilitators influence implementation, including the individual's skills and beliefs.  Although there is some research specifically on the IC facilitator, more is known about others responsible for implementing interventions and programs in schools and other organizations.

**Implementation skills.** The Consultation and Interdisciplinary Relations Workgroup from the *Competencies Conference: Future Directions in Education and Credentialing in Professional Psychology* (Arredondo, Shealy, Neale, &Winfrey, 2004) reported that project management was often a necessary role in consultation.  They delineated several pertinent implementation skills, such as time management, setting and meeting deadlines, allocating resources, communication, client management, and process planning in which a model is used to introduce, intervene and evaluate the project. Facilitation of problem-solving was also highlighted as a relevant implementation skills necessary for consultants and professional collaborators.  According to the workgroup,

consultants and collaborators need the following skills and knowledge to solve problems and facilitate change:

- Knowledge of: needs assessments; system, group and individual behavior; problem-solving models, change models; ethical and legal issues

- Skills in: critical thinking; determining needs generating hypothesis; creating solutions; selecting strategies; evaluating outcomes; and systematic examination of data

- Values that: empower the client; consider stake-holders' interests; display objectivity and support the use of evidence-based strategies.

**Personal characteristics.** Literature on other types of leaders and intervention facilitators also points to personal characteristics relevant to the successful implementation of a program or intervention model. Leading the IC Team is one facet of the facilitators' role. The personal characteristics of the IC Facilitator as a leader are worth attention because research indicates that a variety of organizational outcomes are tied to certain personality traits (Colins, 2001; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). Personality is likely not the only factor, or even the most dominant factor, that determines one's success as a leader; however, personality traits and personal characteristics play a substantial role in leaders' success (Kilburg & Donohue, 2011). Personal knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, values, ethics, history and other individual factors are included as meaningful parts of an integrative framework of leadership described by Kilburg and Donohue (2011).

Klimes-Dougan and colleagues conducted a study to examine contextual factors and their potential links to fidelity of implementation of an evidence-based, early-age

targeted, preventive intervention, named Early Risers (Klimes-Dougan, August, Lee, Realmuto, Blooquist, Horowitz, & Eisenberg, 2009). They collected survey data on the experience, personality traits, beliefs, coping skills and school climate of Early Risers' practitioners working in 27 rural elementary schools, called Family Advocates (FA). The central task of the FA is to bring together resources for families to boost young children's social-emotional and academic success. Klimes-Dougan et al. (2009) found that personality characteristics, in addition to beliefs and school climate factors, were related to fidelity of implementation of a prevention program. Fidelity of programming was negatively correlated with neuroticism and positively correlated with extroversion, openness, and conscientiousness. Optimism was also positively related to fidelity. Authors concluded that their results speak to the need for formal or informal assessment of personality and belief systems when hiring practitioners to implement interventions and innovations.

**Team leadership.** The functions of team leaders depend on the nature of the work and time phase in which the team is working. Morgeson et al. (2010) compiled lists of team leadership functions based on a comprehensive review of leadership literature. Leaders and teams are not static; they must complete tasks within systems and time. Teams function in a cycle of two phases: transition and action. Transition activities focus on evaluation and planning and action activities work to complete tasks and accomplish goals. In the transition phase, leaders perform many functions. First, leaders compose the team. They may assess skills, redistribute responsibilities, or replace members of a team that is already in place. Leaders also define the mission and establish expectations and goals, but team members should play an active role. The team leader must structure and

plan the team's work and determine the best ways in which the team can meet their goals. Also in this phase, leaders train and develop the team. Skills and knowledge related to the content of the team's work must be addressed, as well as those related to the interpersonal processes of the team. Sense-making is another team leader function. Here, the leader interprets and communicates environmental effects that may impact team functioning or goal attainment. Finally, in this phase team leaders provide feedback to maintain the functioning and development of the team system.

In the action phase described by Morgeson et al., team leaders monitor and evaluate the team's progress and performance. Managing team boundaries means that the leader represents the team's interests outside the group. Leaders must challenge the team regarding their performance, assumptions, methods, and processes. The authors also suggest that leaders perform team tasks by taking a more active role in the teams' work. Leaders also solve problems and provide resources. Encouraging self-management and supporting the social climate on the team also fall under the purview of the team leader.

**Beliefs.** The beliefs and mindsets of the adults in schools have an impact on the mindsets, and ultimately, success, of students (Dweck, 2006). According to Dweck, the words and actions of school staff send messages to students about how to think about themselves, highlighting the power of beliefs. Beliefs influence learners' perceptions of risk, success, and failure. Dweck's (2007) research on beliefs culminated in a distinction between two types of mindsets regarding risk and effort: the fixed mindset and the growth mindset. The fixed mindset is orientation toward performance goals (Hong, Chiu, Dweck, Lin, & Wan, 1999). Fixed mindset learners seek success and avoid failure. The

growth mindset individuals see intelligence and ability as malleable (Hong et al., 1999) as they seek out challenges and opportunities for learning. Dweck (2006) states that the growth mindset has a key role in helping teachers and school staff to help students succeed. This is relevant to consultation, not only as it applies to the students at the heart of a case, but also to beliefs and attitudes of school staff implementing interventions for students with academic or behavioral concerns.

The consultation literature indicates that consultants' beliefs can play a significant role in the successful implementation of interventions. Anthanasiou, Geil, Hazel, and Copeland (2002) conducted a qualitative study of four consultant-consultee dyads in an effort to better understand beliefs regarding the causes of student behavior, what roles should teachers play in intervention, and what consultants and consultees believe about the process and efficacy of consultation. All consultants were employed as school psychologists and all consultees were classroom teachers. The data collected from this field-based case study included audio-taped and transcribed interactions between consultant and consultee, written documentation of consultation training for the school psychologists, transcription of individual interviews with teachers (conducted by authors), transcription of group interviews with school psychologists and authors, individual interview transcriptions and a consultant questionnaire. Qualitative data were transcribed and coded for content and assigned descriptor codes. These codes were then categorized and follow-up interview questions were created to address categories in need of clarification. Themes were summarized and reported and peer-feedback was solicited to inform reconsideration of the data and rewriting.

This study revealed that all participants held strong beliefs about the causes of student behavior concerns. Consultees generally focused on the internal factors that might cause student behavior, such as difficulties with social or academic skills and need for attention. Beliefs about the types of treatments or interventions necessary were in line with teachers' beliefs about the internal nature of the concern. Overall, the consultants were more likely to focus on factors outside of the student's control as relevant to the behavior, such as family and home factors. However, the consultants also acknowledge internal factors, but did not give them primary emphasis. Consultants also placed more emphasis on interventions that aligned with their beliefs about the importance of external factors, such as helping teachers access resources in the environment and working with the family. Both internal and external attributions played a role in consultants' views of causes and solutions for behavior problems, but the authors highlight that the focus on the external factors was paramount.

Anthansiou et al. (2004) reported that dyads were more likely to implement interventions that were more closely aligned to the views of the consultant. However both groups acknowledged limits of indirect service, depending on the nature of the child's needs and some direct service was provided by the school psychologists. Beliefs and values may also influence perception of outcomes; teachers' tendency to view interventions as successful only if academic gains were demonstrated- even when behavior or other area was the target of the intervention (Anthansiou et al., 2004).

Anthansiou et al.'s (2004) study highlighted the influence of beliefs on the process of consultation and the perceived outcome. While this study focused on consultants who also function as school psychologists, a similar rationale may be expected for the

importance of beliefs for IC facilitator, since consultation is a significant role for the facilitator (Rosenfield, 2014; Vaganek, 2012).

Beliefs not only influence intervention design and perceived success of interventions, they also play a role in fidelity of implementation and treatment integrity. In their study of the Early Risers practitioners, Klimes-Dougan et. al (2009)  indicated that some aspects of the FA's personality traits, beliefs and coping were related to indices of program implementation fidelity.  Specifically, beliefs of success were positively correlated with fidelity.

Forman and colleagues also found that school psychologists' personal beliefs about interventions influenced their decisions to implement them (Forman, Fagely, Dreitlein Steiner, & Schneider, 2009).  In a survey of practicing school psychologists who had completed a school-based psychosocial intervention course over the past ten years, results indicated that the belief that the intervention would have a positive effect on students was more important than the psychologist's knowledge of the empirical validity of the intervention when it came to implementation decisions.  These findings are consistent with those of Anthanasiou and colleagues (2004), in that intervention selection and implementation is tied closely to the implementer or consultant's beliefs about the problem and the potential solutions.  Although school psychologists in Forman et al.'s study may not have been acting specifically in a consultation capacity, the finding demonstrates the importance of beliefs in intervention and implementation decision-making.  This connection between beliefs and implementation may also be relevant for IC Facilitators, as the beliefs they endorse as important may influence the way in which they train others in IC Teams and carry out their facilitator role.

Another study by Forman and colleagues also revealed that school psychologists' beliefs are related to implementation commitment (Forman, Fagley, Chu, & Walkup, 2012).  In this survey study of a national sample of school psychologists, researchers randomly assigned one of eight versions of a questionnaire to 124 participants.  The demographics were considered consistent with characteristics of National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) membership at the time.  Questionnaires varied in terms of the nature of the client problem (depression vs. diabetes) and teacher involvement vs. no teacher involvement.  The school psychologists were presented with a description of the problem and intervention vignettes.  Results indicated that beliefs about the acceptability and efficacy of an intervention and the school psychologists' perceptions of organizational resources were the most important factors in predicting their intention to implement an intervention.   The authors conclude that school psychologists play an important role in translating research on effective interventions into practice and that their beliefs can be a facilitator or barrier to implementation.

Teacher beliefs regarding innovation implementation were examined by Beets, Flay, Vuchinich, Acock, Li and Alfred (2008).  This study, part of a larger, longitudinal evaluation, looked at the influence of teacher and school-level factors on the fidelity of implementation of a school-based prevention and character development program. Teachers completed school climate questionnaires that focused on administrative support and school connectedness.  Implementation data were collected regarding teachers' attitudes toward the program, the amount of curriculum delivered, and adherence (materials usage). At the end of years 2 and 3, 171 and 191 teachers, respectively, from ten elementary schools completed the end-of-year evaluations. Response rates ranged

from 32% to 100% across schools.   Beets et al. reported that teachers' attitudes toward the program were positively correlated with the amount of program actually delivered school-wide. Consistent with previous research, it appears that teachers who believe a program will be effective and have more positive feelings toward the program are more likely to implement the program.  This may create a self-fulfilling prophecy in a sense, as the expectation is that greater adherence and fidelity may lead to better outcomes.  It is also possible that IC Facilitators and case managers who believe in the tenants of IC may have different patterns of implementation from those who do not share the beliefs.

**Skills and Tasks of the IC Facilitator**

The expected role of the IC facilitator is clearly defined in IC Teams literature and training materials (Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling 2002; Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling, 2007; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996).  Tables 1 show the general tasks and social-emotional skills that Rosenfield and Gravois (1996) outlined as necessary for the facilitator role.  These tasks can be categorized into three groups: (1) tasks facilitating the functioning of the team, (2) assisting individual team members to function as case managers, and (3) creating a favorable school environment.

Table 1

Table 1.

*General Tasks and Social-Emotional Skills (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996)*

| Basic Facilitator Tasks | Socio-emotional Skills of the Facilitator |
| --- | --- |
| Diagnosing individuals | Understanding of group functioning |
| Diagnosing organizations | Skills in team facilitation |
| Managing/organizing | Build trust and confidence of participants |
| Training & coaching | Confront to resolve conflicts |

| | |
|---|---|
| Resource-bringing | Provide appropriate support |
| Demonstrating | Interpersonal ease in relating to others |
| | Initiative-taking |
| | Capacity to organize time, work, and activities |

The original list (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996) was adapted and refined in the training manual to include categories of activities, which include concrete tasks as well as an expanded list of roles and functions. Table 2 is from the IC Teams Facilitator Training Manual and displays the expectations of the role, as communicated to IC facilitators from program trainers (Gravois et al., 2007).

Other activities of IC facilitators are determined by the changing concerns that they and the team face as they move through phases of implementation. Time, stress, and administrative support are likely to be concerns with which the facilitators will need to cope (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). Tasks related to these concerns include communicating with administrators, arranging for professional support, developing a personal support network, setting priorities, scheduling and planning. Program developers also expect that facilitators will engage in training and will receive training and support from their systems facilitator.

Taken together, IC Teams literature and training materials (Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling 2002; Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling, 2007; Rosenfield, 2014; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996) yield a list of expected facilitator tasks, knowledge and skills that include: (a) introducing the IC teams process, (b) developing the team to deliver the innovation, (c) planning, coaching/training, providing professional development, (d)

engaging in case management, and (e) evaluating the organization, team, and the

innovation. These tasks are distributed across phases on implementation of the model.

Table 2.

*IC Facilitator Roles, Functions and Activities from the Facilitator Training Manual*

(*Gravois, Gickling, & Rosenfield, 2007)*

| IC Roles, Functions, and Activities | |
|---|---|
| Role & Function | Activities |
| Help initiate and introduce IC Teams process to school | Plan IC Team Meetings |
| Develop team and delivery system | Conduct IC Team Meetings |
| Provide ongoing training to develop members' skills | Coach Team members |
| Coach individual team members in IC Process | Case consulting |
| Work with principal and key staff to integrate IC into school functioning | Receive External support |
| | Consult with principal |
| | Share information with Staff |
| | Assist in program evaluation |

**Phases of implementation.**

Developers of IC Team designed the program so that the process of

implementation and associated activities are planned, structured, and supported (Gravois

et al., 2007). Training and implementation are designed to occur over a 2 to 3 year period

in three overlapping phases. In Phase 1, the IC Teams model is introduced to schools and

training for the facilitator begins. The trained IC facilitator then trains team members and

begins implementation of case management in Phase 2. Phase 3 includes continued

implementation, maintenance and evaluation. The development of approved IC Team

trainers, who can guide new IC Team facilitator and school implementation, is also included in Phase 3.  Each phase includes training objectives, activities, and implementation indicators, as outlined by program developers.

**Phase 1.** In Phase 1 facilitators will attend overview training with an administrator and key staff from their schools.  Facilitators will then be coached on their work with a teacher (consultee) on a training case in their school setting.  Trainers provide assignments and feedback on other aspects of their role during this phase.  On-site training and networking sessions will also occur, to further build facilitation skills. New facilitators may also network with and receive training from district or state level facilitators. These facilitators may be an approved trainer or may have responsibilities at the systems level to support IC Teams, outside of the traditional school setting. Facilitators are expected to begin outreach to their schools through newsletters, staff presentation, and demonstrations. Collaboratively with administration, facilitators will generate a team. This phase is designed to provide didactic training, demonstration of skills, and opportunities for skill application and practice, as facilitators begin to develop their skills and move the school toward adoption of the model.

**Phase 2.** Phase 2 has some overlapping objectives with the first phase.  At this point, facilitators begin the work of team facilitation.  They schedule and hold weekly meetings, develop team training.  Facilitators continue to take cases and provide information to staff. Teams begin to practice new skills and solicit training cases, and the facilitators coach team members through practice and initial cases.  Training for facilitators also continues, as they learn more about data collection for evaluation and

feedback.  Facilitators establish relationships with fellow IC facilitators from other schools in the their district.

Phase 3. During Phase 3 school-level facilitators work with district-level facilitators for additional training and networking.  During this phase facilitators collect and review implementation data to inform annual team goals.  New team members may be recruited and training of the team continues.  Facilitators likely need to differentiate training in this phase to meet the needs of team members with varying levels of experience.

Some school-based facilitators may be certified as approved trainers for IC teams. Approved trainers have successfully completed six stages in which they have: (1) completed their own facilitator training, (2) trained team members, (3) coached case managers in other school districts via email, (4) provided on-site technical assistance to other facilitators in lower phases, (5) provided skill acquisition training to other facilitators, and (6) taught overview training to new facilitators.  After Stage 6, the facilitator may be approved as an IC Team Trainer (Gravois, Gickling, & Rosenfield, 2007).

**Research on IC Team Facilitator Role**

The IC Facilitator has been recognized as an integral piece of the implementation puzzle for IC Teams.  The role was designed to address many of tasks that are now called implementation activities.  Although qualitative and experimental means have been used to study a variety of outcomes and factors associated with IC Teams (e.g., Rosenfield, Gravois, & Silva, 2014), only a limited number of studies have focused specifically on

the role of the IC Facilitator to better understand the specific tasks required for the job, the importance of such tasks, and facilitator stability.

Rosenfield and Gravois (1996) selected skills outlined by Saxl, Lieberman, and Miles (1987) as the basis for an analysis of the tasks and skills necessary by IC facilitators. These skills can be found in Appendix A. Data were collected by program developers from audio-tapped facilitator logs. Coding revealed that mastery of the content of the IC Teams and an understanding of educational issues were found to be necessary for the job. Educational content was also stated in the logs as a key knowledge necessary for carrying out the job. IC facilitators also reported beliefs and values consistent with the underlying assumptions of the IC Teams model. Interpersonal skills were also considered vital to the role of the IC facilitator.

McMahon (1998) conducted a study of perceptions of facilitators and IC Team members in urban and suburban schools. This quantitative study captured a narrow scope of skills, as the list of items was based on the same list by Saxl, Lieberman and Miles (1987) that was also used as a framework for coding by Rosenfield and Gravois (1996). Participants rated the importance of the skills to the facilitation of IC Teams, the frequency of use by the facilitator, and the skill level of the facilitator. Facilitators and team members rated all 18 skills as moderately to very important, with a frequency of use that varied from infrequent to very frequent. Facilitator's self-report of skill levels ranged from minimally to highly skilled. McMahon's study of the perceived importance of these 18 skills points to some agreement between the expectations of the program developers and the actual beliefs of IC team members and facilitators. McMahon's research added confirming evidence for the importance of some of the skills recognized

as essential by program developers.  However, the study design did not investigate the presence of other skills outside of those listed by Saxl, Lieberman and Miles (1987).

Until 2009, research on IC Facilitators was based on the frameworks and lists of specific skills outlined by other authors and evaluated by IC Facilitators.  Until then, facilitators themselves had not described their own roles in a systematic format.  Neall and Cassata (2009), an active IC facilitator and a supervisor of program evaluation in their school district, used an online survey to collect open-ended responses from facilitators about their role.  Twenty-five of the 28 facilitators employed by the district participated.  IC Facilitators also had the opportunity to rate their satisfaction and agreement with several statements regarding their role. The purpose of the survey was to inform a strategic growth plan for IC Teams within the school district

Facilitators' comments provide some evidence for the variability found in perceptions of the role by facilitators within the study.  Some facilitators found networking and collaboration among facilitators to be important, while others saw less utility in these activities. Variability in the extent to which facilitators fulfill job responsibilities was also evident in responses. Training was also a prominent theme in the open-ended comments, as some facilitators reported receiving excellent training and support.  Some respondents were also critical of fellow facilitators who did not take full advantage of the training opportunities provided.   Communication appeared to be important on various levels, including: between IC Teams trainers and the school district; between IC Facilitators; between facilitators and the team; and stake holders in the district and team members in the schools (Neall & Cassata, 2009). Only the facilitators in one school district were asked to participate.  That particular district is of note because it

was concurrently engaged in a university partnership to study the efficacy of IC Teams (Nelson et al., 2009). This is a limitation, in that the sample was restricted to one district and the implementation context.

Berger et al. (2014) 's study of the utilization of IC Teams indicated that there was considerable facilitator turnover in schools using IC Teams within an experimental study (Berger et al., 2014); nine of 17 treatment schools had different facilitators over the course of three years. Of the nine schools that experienced facilitator turnover in the first three years of the project, seven schools had two facilitators and two schools had three facilitators (i.e., a new facilitator each school year). Utilization was measured two ways: (1) how many teachers in the school used the services of the team, according to survey results, (2) utilization as reported in program records.

Berger et al. (2014) found that facilitator stability was positively and significantly related to both measures of utilization. Facilitators are tasked in phases 2 and 3 with recruiting and training team members and managing the team (Gravois et al., 2007), and a trained facilitator is necessary for carrying out these activities. Although Berger et al.'s study was not designed to identify causes of utilization, findings suggested that stability of IC facilitators may be influential in program use. This conclusion is consistent with other literature on the relationship between team facilitators/facilitator characteristics and implementation (e.g., Kilburg & Donohoe, 2011).

Berger et al. (2014) also provided case illustrations with descriptive data about schools demonstrating high, average and low utilization of IC Teams during the study period. The facilitator was described in each instance as playing an important role in utilization. Berger et al. reported that one high utilization school had a stable facilitator

for all three years of the study. The facilitator was a nationally certified teacher who was reported to be knowledgeable about instruction. This individual was described as efficient. This facilitator also engaged in action research with other facilitators in the district. His leadership and enthusiasm was noted by researchers as likely playing a role in the high rates of utilization of IC Teams in that particular school.

In the *average utilization* school, facilitator turnover was cited as a factor impacting utilization. Utilization more than doubled in year two following a change of facilitator. The facilitator was described as efficient. The facilitator quickly completed his or her own training and then provided turn-around training to the team. The administrator was brought on board by the facilitator and participated on the team. Berger et al. reported that this facilitator had built credibility among the staff and actively advocated for teacher utilization of IC Teams.

The facilitator was also identified as a key factor in understanding the pattern of a school with low teacher utilization of IC Teams. In this case, Berger et al. noted that this school had a different facilitator for each year of the study. There was also a period of several months during which there was no facilitator at all. The team attempted to continue without the support of a trained facilitator. However, by the end of the study it appeared that IC Teams had lost support and utilization was very low. Berger et al.'s study findings and case studies point to the practical need to better understand the role of the facilitator on implementation and utilization.

**Facilitator as Consultant: Review of Core Consultant Competencies**

Case management is the first part of the role that the IC Facilitator learns. The facilitators engage actively in case management in addition to training and supporting

their fellow team members.  Given that case management is central to the facilitator role, the core competencies and important characteristics of consultants are expected to overlap considerably with those of the facilitator.  According to Gravois (2012), there is increased consensus regarding the essential competencies for consultants.  These include:

- Developing relationships with consultees
- Applying problem-solving structures
- Having knowledge of interventions
- Understanding the impact of consultation in a multi-cultural context

Burkhouse (2012) used a Delphi study to explore and find consensus for the core competencies of consultants.  The Delphi method is a tool for seeking consensus among literature and expert researchers and trainers. Results from two iterations of a survey administered to consultation researchers and trainers indicated 35 essential core competencies for consultants.  Competencies items were considered essential if they were reported by at least 75% of participants.

Several personal characteristics were also considered essential.  The top four characteristics were:

- Capacity to form quality relationships
- Trustworthiness
- Perspective-taking skills
- Acting as a reflective practitioner

Other highly rated items included (rated by at least 50% of participants):

- Honesty
- Good Judgment & Decision-Making

- Genuineness/openness/authenticity

- Empathy

- Flexibility

- Self-Awareness/Clear sense of identity

- Self-control/management of self

Ratings indicated that time-management, reflection, and self-control/managements of self are perceived as the most trainable skills. The least trainable consultation skills were reported to be honesty, trustworthiness, and genuineness/openness/authenticity. Burkhouse's work revealed that some of the most essential personal characteristics for the consultants are also the least likely to be trainable. These findings may have implications for selection and training of IC Teams facilitators who are expected to become consultants as part of their role. Until now, research has not yet been conducted regarding the most essential and trainable personal characteristics of the IC Facilitator. Participants in Vaganek's (2012) interview study of IC facilitators reported some similar characteristics, such as building relationships, reflecting, helping others to reflect, and flexibility.

**A Job Analysis of the IC Facilitator**

To better understand the role of the IC facilitator, from the perspective of those who undertake it, Vaganek (2012) conducted a job analysis. Twelve facilitators participated in 60 to 90 minute semi-structured interviews about the tasks, KSAs, beliefs, and performance standards necessary for facilitator to do their jobs. The result was a list of task and belief statements (See Appendix B that formed the basis of the survey instrument of the current study.

**Task and skills.** Many of the tasks and skills reported by facilitators in Vaganek's (2012) study overlap with those outlined by program developers in IC Teams literature and training materials (Gravois et al., 2002). Table 3 contains a summary of the results of the Vaganek (2012) job analysis.

Table 3.

*Key Facilitator Skills and Corresponding Interview Categories and Statements*

| Expected Key Facilitator Tasks and KSA | Interview Generated Categories and Statements |
| --- | --- |
| Facilitator Tasks | |
| Diagnosing Individuals | Team Business: Assess team and team members |
| Diagnosing Organizations | NA |
| Training | Training |
| Managing/controlling | Skills: Use Management Skills |
| Resource-bringing | Team Business: set up/build team; Case Management: Problem-Solving process; Admin. Contact: present to school board |
| Socioemotional Skills that Support Change | |
| Group Functioning | Team Business: Maintain meeting climate; |
| Trust/Rapport Building | Skills: Use Interpersonal Skills; |
| Support | Facilitator Training: Engage in Peer Networking; |
| Confrontation | Conflict |
| Conflict Mediation | Conflict: Manage conflict between programs; Manage conflict between Case Managers and Consultees; Manage conflict between team members |
| Confidence Building | Abilities/Attributes: Interpersonal Skills; Team Business: Build confidence of team members |
| Collaboration | Beliefs: Belief in collaboration; Case Management |
| Interpersonal Skills | |
| Interpersonal Ease | Abilities/Attributes: Interpersonal Skills |
| Administrative/Organizational Skills | Organizational/Clerical Tasks |
| Initiative-Taking | Abilities/Attributes: Executive Functioning Skills |
| Knowledge | |
| Education-general | Knowledge: Know content/curriculum; Know best practices in instruction |
| Content of Innovation | Knowledge: Know IC Teams process/Philosophy; Know Change Process |

**IC facilitator characteristics.** IC Facilitators in the interview study (Vaganek, 2012) also revealed several self-reported personal traits that were consistent with the expected traits from IC literature. Facilitators reported that several traits and attributes

were necessary for or facilitated the completion of the tasks within the facilitator role. These specific traits were categorized into: executive functioning skills (also considered implementation skills), interpersonal skills, and personal attributes. In the interview research, facilitators reported several examples of executive functioning skills, such as breaking things down into smaller parts, organizing tasks and materials, initiating tasks, being flexible and multi-tasking. This category was named executive functioning skills because it bore a striking resemblance to the types of activities described by researchers and practitioners as executive skills — the brain-based skills that people use to *execute* tasks (Dawson & Guare, 2009). "Implementation skills" is another term that describes this category (Arredondo, Shealy, Neale, &Winfrey, 2004).

Facilitators Interpersonal skills include statements such as:

- engaging in work with groups and people with different personalities,

- empathizing with, empowering, and helping others feel safe and certain,

- being able to 'read' other people,

- dealing with hard questions and attitudes of adults,

- helping others to reflect.

Some of the abilities and attributes mentioned by facilitators in Vaganek's (2012) research did not easily lend themselves to the task-statement format recommended in the job analysis literature. However, these examples were included under the category of Personal Attributes and they represent characteristics or ways of engaging in tasks that may be important to the role. Some facilitators described the need to be patient, take risks, and be firm but understanding and supportive in their role.

Many of the attributes, abilities, and traits in Vaganek's (2012) study are supported by the literature on team facilitation. Burkhouse (2012) found consensus for several personal characteristics deemed important for consultants by experts in the field. The following abilities and attributes were reported in Burkhouse's and Vaganek's work:

- Capacity to form relationships

- Ability to reflect

- Ability to help others to reflect

Vaganek's (2012) findings also overlap with the implementation skills and knowledge viewed as critical by Arredondo et al. (2004) including:

- Knowledge of group behavior

- Problem-solving skill

- Understanding of the change process

- Knowledge of assessment

*IC facilitator beliefs*. IC Facilitators in Vaganek's interview study were asked, "Are there necessary beliefs or assumptions in order to be successful in your role? If so, what are they?" In general, facilitators reported beliefs and assumptions that fell into three categories: 1) Facilitators stated that they believe that IC is a good process. Variations of that theme included comments such as facilitators must believe it can work, believe in the mission of IC, have a vision of how IC can work in their school, and have a commitment to following the process with integrity. 2) According to responses to the question of necessary beliefs, facilitators felt they must believe in collaboration. Examples included believing that teachers can work together, and that facilitators should not let their own beliefs interfere when working with others. Some facilitators included

that "no one is an expert" as a necessary belief. One potential interpretation of this direct

quote from some facilitators is that all participants have expertise to share, but that the

consultation relationship is non-hierarchical. In the IC literature, this phrase

communicates that the consultant taking an expert-stance may not be effective in

collaboration. More information about the beliefs of a larger sample of facilitators may

shed lights on the interpretation. 3) The third necessary belief or assumption reported by

facilitators is that they must assume children can learn, however noting that not all

children learn in the same way or at the same rate. Facilitators did not report beliefs that

indicated they held a fixed mindset, in which intelligence is unchangeable (Dweck,

2006). Existing research on implementers of interventions indicates that implementation

is more likely to occur when the underlying beliefs in an intervention aligns with the

implementers' own belief-system (Anthanasiou et al, 2002; Klimes-Dougan et al, 2009).

The extent to which facilitators agree with the importance of the basic tenants of IC

Teams may influence implementation fidelity.

The themes that facilitators communicated in response to a question about beliefs

or assumptions necessary for success in their role mirror some of the critical assumptions

outlined by Gravois, Rosenfield, and Gickling (2002) in the general IC manual:

- All students can learn

- Early intervention is preferable to waiting for failure

- The critical arena for intervention is the student-teacher relationship within the
  general education classroom

- The instructional match (between student, task and instruction and setting are the
  focus of problem solving

- A problem-solving community is the foundation for professional and student learning

- Teachers, as professionals, are entitled to consult and collaborate

- Change is an on-going process

Generally, the facilitators in the interview study focused more on beliefs about student learning and collaboration than on beliefs about early intervention or intervening in the general education classroom.

**Summary**

Consultation teams have been used in schools as a vehicle for increasing student performance and teacher skills (Rosenfield, 2008). Like other evidence-based interventions, consultee-centered consultation models require attention to the complex process of implementation in order for one to expect results. The IC Facilitator is a key factor in the successful implementation of IC Teams. The skills, beliefs and characteristics of other team facilitators and implementers of innovations have influenced implementation in a variety of contexts (Athanasiou et al., 2002; Beets et al., 2008; Klimes-Dougan et al., 2009; Forman et al., 2009; Forman et al., 2012). Some work has been conducted to better understand the personal characteristics critical for consultants (Burkhouse, 2012) and considerable research exits on the personality traits of leaders in the world of business. However, it is critical to learn more about IC Facilitators' perspectives on the important knowledge, skills, abilities, characteristics and beliefs necessary for successful IC facilitation, since the facilitator plays such an important role in the implementation of this, as in other, innovations.

The purpose of the current research is to expand upon a previous interview study and other research on facilitators.  Using a survey methodology, the study assesses the perceived importance and the changeability through training and experience of the beliefs, facilitator characteristics, and implementation skills of IC Team Facilitators.  The beliefs, characteristics, and skills included in the study have been shown to have a relationship with implementation and leadership in other fields and lines of research.  Chapter 3 contains the methodology for the current study.

**Chapter 3: Methods**

In this chapter, a detailed methodology is presented, including a description of the study participants, survey design and administration, and data analysis procedures. The purpose of this research is to extend the understanding by facilitators of the perceived importance and changeability through training and experience of several beliefs, tasks, skills, facilitator characteristics, and knowledge reported in the literature (Burkhouse, 2012; McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012).

**Participants**

**Selection of participants.** An electronic spreadsheet containing facilitator names and email addresses was provided to the principal investigator by Dr. Todd Gravois, President of ICAT Resources. Currently, ICAT Resources maintains a database of all schools officially conducting the IC Team model. This document was organized by schools within school districts/divisions. The file was cleaned manually to identify duplicates, so that facilitators working in multiple schools only received one copy of each email communication. After eliminating duplicates and contact information for one set of interns, 171 unique facilitator names were identified. Two facilitators had invalid email addresses and were not able to receive survey invitations. A total of 169 IC Facilitators were contacted and invited to participate in the survey. Approximately 53% (N 89) of active facilitators participated in the survey. Non-response bias may be a concern when interpreting the following results and interpretation. It is impossible to know if there are meaningful differences between the responders and non-responders. The results and

interpretation in this study are based on the responses of half of the population of facilitators.

**Participant characteristics.** Eighty-nine facilitators completed the voluntary online survey; however three entries included no data for any variable after the participant clicked "I agree to participate". These three respondents were removed, as they provided no data that could be analyzed. One participant clicked "I do not agree to participate" and that line of data was also removed. The number of respondents for individual items ranged from 78 to 85. Descriptive characteristics of the participants are reported in valid percents, meaning that the percentages represent only those facilitators that answered the question. See Table 4 for the complete frequency and percent data on the demographic and contextual variables. Skipped items and the option to choose more than one response for some items resulted in some percentages that do not add up to 100.

Facilitators in the study generally work in elementary schools (71%). Female facilitators make up approximately 92% of the sample. A majority of participants (83%) facilitate just one team and 18% facilitate two teams. A small number of respondents endorsed facilitating three or more teams (5%). Most facilitators are in the role part-time (61%), which is consistent with previous literature on IC Teams (Rosenfield, 2014). Just over half of the respondents reported facilitating an additional, unrelated team in their schools (57%). Additional teams facilitated by participants included: special education teams; data teams; grade level teams; leadership committee/teams; and professional learning groups.

The majority of participants were teachers before they became full or part time facilitators. The most common previous role was general education teacher (46%)

followed by special education teacher (30%).  Counselors and school psychologists made up only 6% of the sample. Other roles reported by individual facilitators included administrator and speech-language pathologist.  Most facilitators continued to work in the same school once they took on their role as facilitator (77%).

Years of IC facilitator experience ranged from zero to 20 years. Program developers and trainers expect that facilitators have completed all three phases of training and implementation by the end of year three. Novice facilitators with 0 to 3 years of experience made up nearly half (43 %) of the sample, with 36 participants. Novice facilitators may have a range of experience with the phases of implementation. However, novice facilitators continue to develop their knowledge and skills and they continue to receive training and technical support. Veterans with 4 or more years of experience, who are expected to have completed the full training sequence, made up 56 % of the sample. Based on the IC training manual (Gravois et al., 2007), it is reasonable to assume that veteran facilitators have received the full training and technical support, which addresses continued implementation, maintenance, and evaluation of the IC Team model (Gravois et al., 2007). Participants reported the most advanced team they have led in relation to Phase of Implementation. Most participants led or were currently leading teams in Phase 3 (58%); Phase 2 made up the next largest group, with 30% of facilitators. This phase variable is a reflection of the training the facilitator has completed, with Phase 3 as the most advanced. IC facilitators who had only led teams in Phase 1 were the smallest group, making up only 7% of the sample. Based on the phases of implementation reported, the vast majority of the study sample has been trained in their own case management skills as well as the team components of the program.

Table 4.

*Facilitator Demographics and Contextual Variable*

| Demographic/Contextual Variable | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Female | 77 | 93 |
| Male | 6 | 7 |
| Approved Trainer | 53 | 64 |
| Coached Others (not on team) | 31 | 37 |
| Completed a Coached Case | 82 | 99 |
| Previous Role-Administrator | 1 | 1 |
| Previous Role- School Counselor | 2 | 2 |
| Previous Role- School Psychologist | 3 | 4 |
| Previous Role- general education teacher | 38 | 46 |
| Previous Role- Special Education Teacher | 25 | 30 |
| Work in Same School as Previous Role | 64 | 77 |
| Percent of time allocated to Role: <25% | 28 | 34 |
| Percent of time allocated to Role: 25% | 13 | 16 |
| Percent of time allocated to Role: 50% | 18 | 22 |
| Percent of time allocated to Role: 75% | 5 | 6 |
| Percent of time allocated to Role: 100% | 10 | 12 |
| Education Degree | 72 | 87 |
| Novice (0- 3 years experience) | 36 | 43 |
| Veteran (4+ years experience) | 47 | 57 |
| Most Advanced Phase: 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Most Advanced Phase: 2 | 26 | 31 |
| Most Advanced Phase: 3 | 50 | 60 |
| Current Phase: 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Current Phase: 2 | 28 | 34 |
| Current Phase: 3 | 49 | 59 |
| Rural School | 39 | 47 |
| Suburban School | 26 | 31 |
| Urban School | 18 | 22 |
| Facilitate 1 Team | 65 | 82 |
| Facilitate 2 Teams | 14 | 18 |
| Full-Time Facilitator | 29 | 35 |
| Part-Time Facilitator | 52 | 63 |
| Facilitate Other Team | 49 | 59 |
| Elementary School | 59 | 71 |
| Middle School | 6 | 7 |
| High School | 8 | 10 |

## Survey Design and Administration

**Survey content.** Survey items were generated by the researcher based on a review of general consultation and facilitation literature, IC Teams training documents and research that specifically focused on IC Teams and facilitators (Burkhouse, 2012; McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012). Two individual phone interviews were completed with trainers of IC Facilitators for the purposes of revising and editing the draft of the survey instrument created for this study. Experts were asked to review the online survey in real-time while speaking with the investigator. They were asked to review the content and directions and to provide feedback regarding additions, deletions, and revisions.

In response to the feedback provided by the experts, several items were added. The document in Appendix C provides a visual representation of the changes made to produce the final survey. Major changes included revising and rewording the directions for the section on changeability. Additionally the number of response options was changed and labels were provided for each section. It was suggested by both experts that the question stem should be provided for each section. Several demographic and contextual questions were also added as a result of the expert interviews. Appendix C highlights the additions, deletions and revisions made to the final survey. Appendix D details the interview questions that were posed to the experts to inform the survey revisions. The reader is referred to Appendix E for the complete list of survey items and instructions that was presented to participants.

**IRB approval.** This study received approval by the University of Maryland Institutional Review Board on June 23, 2014. An amendment/modification application was approved on July 7, 2014 for changes made to the survey following the pilot

(discussed below) and expert feedback. An application for an IRB extension was filed and was approved on June 1, 2015 for this project. All IRB approval documents are provided in Appendix F.

**Pilot.** Four volunteer participants who received consultation training as graduate students completed a pilot of the online survey for the purposes of providing basic feedback on ease of use, clarity of directions and items, and completion time. Data were not saved for these participants. Feedback from pilot participants was used to edit the online survey before final submission to the IRB and to provide an estimated completion time in the invitation email to IC Facilitators. Pilot participants indicated that the survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. Survey participants were informed that the anticipated time commitment for their participation was expected to be 10 to 15 minutes.

**Survey administration.** Participants received a personalized email to introduce the study, ask if they would agree to participate, and ensure that the email address on file was valid for the participant. The link to the online survey was also provided so that facilitators could participate immediately if they chose to do so. Twenty-four facilitators replied *yes* to the initial email. A reply email was sent to them with the survey link. Two additional personalized emails were sent to request facilitators' participation in the study. These emails reiterated the purpose of the study, asked their intent to participate, and provided the survey link as well as the online link to read the consent information. The initial invitation email, survey link email and reminder emails to participants can be found in Appendices H, I, J and K, respectively. The informed consent letter is located in Appendix L.

***Response rates.*** Steps were taken to increase response rates, such as solicitation of intent to participate in the first email, use of personalized emails, reminder emails, and a raffle for incentives (Hamilton, 2009; Heerwegh & Lossveldt, 2007; Jensen, 2013; Zarca, 2013). Several online survey sites recommend using a personalized email as a way to increase response rates (Hamilton, 2009; Zarca, 2013). An experimental study by Heerwegh and Loosveldt (2007) found a statistically significant increase in response rates to online surveys when a personalized email contact was used. The survey was open for approximately 8 weeks. A response period of at least two weeks is recommended in the literature (Hamilton, 2009). The survey was originally sent in the July 2014. Many facilitators were likely off work for the summer. The survey window was open through the beginning of the school year so that facilitators returning to work were able to participate. Some facilitators may not have been in their positions when they received the initial invitation to participate.

***Incentives.*** Survey participants were given the option to voluntarily include their name and email address for entry into a drawing for one of eight $25 Amazon.com gift certificates. A random number generating website was used to identify eight winners from the pool of 71 participants that entered their name and email address. Gift certificates were emailed to the winners through Amazon's website. Gift certificates were included as a thank-you gesture as well as a meaningful incentive intended to increase response rates. (Zacara, 2013).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Survey responses were downloaded and imported to statistical software, IBM SPSS Version 22.0, for analysis. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs, knowledge, abilities, skills, tasks, and characteristics reported in previous studies as related to the IC Team facilitator role (e.g. McMahon, 1998; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012) as not important, important, or essential?

2. What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs, and characteristics as not at all changeable, somewhat changeable or very changeable by training and experience?

3. Do IC Facilitators' ratings of importance and changeability differ significantly by phase of implementation completed by the facilitators or years of experience?

**Research questions 1 and 2:** Facilitators rated how important each belief and personal characteristic is for the facilitators to do their job. Response options included: 1 Not Important; 2 Important; and 3 Essential. Similar responses were available for the changeability through training and experience of various beliefs and characteristics: 1 Not at all changeable; 2 Somewhat changeable; and 3 Very changeable. The frequencies for each item were run and data are presented in Tables 5 to 13 in Chapter 4.

In order to determine the percent of all IC facilitators who would likely rate each the item as 1, 2, or 3, the standard error of percent for a finite pool was calculated. First, the standard error of the percent of facilitators who endorsed each rating was computed. This statistic estimates the precision of the percentage of facilitators in the general population that would also rate the item as important (Levine, Stephan, & Szabat, 2013).

The observed value and upper and lower limits of the range are reported in Tables 5 to 13. The pool of potential participants for this study is relatively small and finite. Based on the data provided by Dr. Todd Gravois of ICAT Resources, there were 171 IC

Teams facilitators at the time of the study. A correction factor for sampling from a finite

pool was used to find the standard error of a percentage (Levine et al., 2013). The

standard error of percentage is represented in the following equation:

$$SEp = \sqrt{pq/N}$$

The correction factor for a finite population is represented in the following equation:

$$fpc = \sqrt{(N - n)/(N - 1)}$$

where

n=sample size

N= population size

*SEp* is multiplied by the *fpc* in order to calculate the corrected standard error of percent.

The standard error is expected to become smaller when the correction is applied (Pearson,

2013). Therefore a more precise estimate of the standard error is expected when the finite

population correction formula is used. A 95% confidence interval was used and a range

of percentages were calculated using the following formulas:

Lower bound: estimated proportion - $1.96 \times \text{SE}_p$

Upper bound: estimated proportion + $1.96 \times \text{SE}_p$

These calculations were repeated for all task and characteristic items in the

survey. Analyses were repeated for each rating (1 to 3), resulting in an observed value of

the sample and upper and lower estimates of the percentage of the general facilitator

population who would rate the item similarly, with 95% confidence.

The same statistical procedure was repeated to determine the upper and lower

percentages of all facilitators who are likely to rate each item as Not Changeable,

Changeable, Very Changeable by training and experience. These data are presented in Table 14.

  **Research question 3:** Differences by training and experience were examined by the Chi Square Test of Independence, which is used to determine if there is a relation between two categorical variables. In this study the chi square test was used to determine if differences in ratings of importance and changeability were associated with the training and experience of the facilitators.  Differences between facilitators were addressed in two ways. First, facilitators were divided based on the most advanced phase of implementation through which they led a team (Phase 1, 2, or 3). Second, facilitators were divided into two groups based on years of experience. Novice facilitators were defined as participants who self-reported zero to three years of experience as an IC facilitator. Veteran facilitators included all participates who self-reported four or more years of experience. IC Teams training literature (Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling, 2002) indicated that facilitators generally complete all phases of training within three years. Even though facilitators in year 3 may be leading teams in Phase 3, facilitators continue their skill development and continue to receive technical support (D. Nelson, personal communication, April 1, 2015).  The null hypothesis for each test is that there will be no relation between group membership, in this case most years of experience, and ratings on each item.

  There are several critical assumptions for the chi square test of independence. This test requires categorical variables that are mutually exclusive and groups must be unrelated. Each participant can only contribute to one cell in each analysis. The expected

counts or frequencies for more than 80% of the cells must exceed 5. If 20% or more cells have counts less than 5, then the significance of the result is likely to be overestimated.

*Differences by phase:* Also, related to question 3, differences by phase were also examined, looking at whether facilitators' perceptions of the importance and changeability of tasks, KSAs, characteristics and beliefs are independent of the facilitators' experiences implementing IC Teams (as measured by Phase and years of experience). The null hypothesis for each test is that there will be no relation between group membership, in this case most advanced team led, and ratings on each item. The alternative hypothesis for each item is that ratings of importance and changeability will vary based on the highest-phase team that the facilitator has led. For example, facilitators who have more training and experience may value certain attributes or hold certain beliefs that differ from their less experienced colleagues. Initially, facilitators were divided into three groups based on the most advanced team they reported to have led. However, only 6 facilitators fell into the Phase 1 group. Frequencies for most advance team led (Phase 1, Phase 2 or Phase 3) are reported in Table 15. Due to the small cell size for the Phase 1 group, these cases were not included in the data analysis. Including this group would have violated a critical assumption of the Chi Square analysis. Instead, Phase 2 and Phase 3 facilitators were compared.

Expected and observed counts for each group are presented in Tables16 to 31. The expected counts are based on the assumption that there is no association between the importance/changeability ratings and the phase/experience variable. When the observed counts do differ from the expected, the chi square test helps to identify if the difference is statistically significant. Significant associations between the Phase/Experience variables

and the ratings of importance/changeability were identified using the Pearson Chi Square

coefficient. Alpha values of less than or equal to .05 were considered significant.  The chi

square tests produced $2 \times 3$ tables and the Cramer's V statistics was calculated to

determine the effect sizes of significant associations. Significant chi square findings are

presented in Tables 16 to 31.  Chi square data for all items are provided in Appendices N

and M.

Controlling for Type 1 error: Given the large number of hypotheses tested

simultaneously, it is necessary to control for the false discovery rate. In other words, this

adjustment addresses type 1 errors, or false positive findings. The Benjamini-Hochberg

Method was used to adjust for multiple comparisons (U.S. Department of Education,

2014). The following procedure was applied to each category or family of items with at

least one significant relationship.  First, the p-values for all items in the category were

ranked in ascending order.  Second, a critical p-value was computed where:

$$p_x^{`} = \chi \alpha / M.$$

M is the total number of items in the category.

$\chi$ is the rank order of the original p-value.

$\alpha$ is the p value of .05.

Third, a cut point was identified by selecting the largest rank that satisfied the

condition $p_x < p_x^{`}$.  This difference is designated as $p_y$. P -values less than or equal to the

value of $p_y$ are statistically significant. The Benjamini-Hochberg Method does not

generate new p-values for each item.  Instead, the method determines if the original

findings are significant relative to a preselected significance level.  The method is only

applied to significant findings, as non-significant values will remain non-significant after the adjustment (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

**Chapter 4: Results**

In this chapter the results of the study are discussed in detail. Each research question is addressed. In addition, a description of supplemental analyses is discussed.

**Research Question 1**

What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs, knowledge, abilities, skills, tasks, and characteristics reported in previous studies as related to the IC Team facilitator role (e.g. McMahon, 1998; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012) as not important, important, or essential?

The following results and discussion represent the percent of participating facilitators who rated each item as not important, important, or essential. The 95% confidence interval represents the range of all facilitators who would be expected to rate the item similarly. The upper and lower limits of the confidence interval were calculated using the corrected standard error of percent in order to account for the small, finite population of facilitators. When interpreting the data for Research Question 1, it is important to consider the response rate for the survey. Approximately half of the facilitator population participated in the survey. There is no information available regarding the non-responders and it is not clear if there are meaningful differences between responders and non-responders.

**Knowledge**

Participating facilitators generally rated the knowledge items as important or essential, as shown in Table 5. *Knowledge of the IC process/philosophy* stands out as a critical item, as 99% of respondents rated it as an essential piece of knowledge. The remaining 1% of respondents identified IC process knowledge as important. An estimated

98-100% of all facilitators in the population would be expected to rate this particular item as essential. Ratings for all items in this category suggest that the knowledge identified in the IC and facilitator literature (e.g. McMahon, 1998; Vaganek, 2012) continues to ring true for responding facilitators and are expected to be important or essential to the full population of IC facilitators.

Table 5.

*Knowledge: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

| | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Know principles of learning & behavior for children | 0 | [0, 0] | 19 | [15, 24] | 81 | [76, 85] |
| Know Best Practice in Instruction | 0 | [0, 0] | 28 | [23, 33] | 72 | [67, 77] |
| Know principals of learning & behavior for adults | 2 | [1, 4] | 34 | [29, 39] | 64 | [59, 69] |
| Know content/curriculum | 4 | [2, 6] | 66 | [61, 71] | 30 | [25, 35] |
| Know IC process/philosophy | 0 | [0, 1] | 1 | [0, 2] | 99 | [98, 100] |
| Know change process | 1 | [0, 2] | 31 | [26, 36] | 67 | [62, 73] |
| Know about team dynamics & team functioning | 0 | [0, 0] | 16 | [12, 20] | 84 | [80, 88] |

**Beliefs**

Three belief statements were rated as important or essential by 100% of respondents. All participants indicated that it is important for facilitators to *believe IC can work, believe that all staff members have valuable expertise* and *believe that one must work in a non-evaluative capacity with staff.* These belief statements are consistent with ideas and values that are taught in IC Teams training (Gravois, Rosenfield & Gickling, 2002) and were reported by facilitators in Vaganek's (2012) job analysis interviews. More variability in responses was observed in statements regarding fixed vs.

growth mindsets. About half (46-57%) of facilitators rate that it is important to *believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability*. An additional 33-44% would likely say this belief is essential to the role of facilitator. When asked about ability over effort, half (45-56%) of the facilitators are expected to rate that holding this belief was not important.

Table 6.

*Beliefs: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

| | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Believe IC can work | 0 | [0, 0] | 14 | [11, 18] | 86 | [82, 89] |
| Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability | 10 | [7, 13] | 52 | [46, 57] | 38 | [33, 44] |
| Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort | 51 | [45, 56] | 43 | [38, 49] | 6 | [4, 9] |
| Believe that all school staff have valuable expertise | 0 | [0, 0] | 28 | [23, 33] | 72 | [67, 77] |
| Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers | 0 | [0, 0] | 18 | [14, 22] | 82 | [78, 86] |

**Abilities and characteristics**

When asked about the perceived importance of various abilities and characteristics related to the IC facilitator role, most respondents reported items to be important or essential. Several characteristics were endorsed as essential by a strong majority, including:

- Relationship-building;
- trustworthiness;
- time management;

- multi-tasking;

- flexibility;

- seeing the bigger picture;

- helping others reflect;

- helping others to feel safe;

- handling challenging situations;

- aligning program goals.

**Skills**

The IC facilitator skills identified in the literature and training documents were also identified in the survey as important or essential to most facilitators. One item of note was *have strong case management skills*. Many rated this as essential (74-83%). None rated it as unimportant.

**Case management tasks**

Regarding case management tasks, facilitators found that *modeling effective case management* and *engaging in the problem solving process* were important or essential to all. There was less agreement as to whether it is important for facilitators to carry out instructional assessment for their team members or sit with their case managers during meetings with teachers.

**Team-related tasks**

Most of the team-related tasks that were evaluated by the facilitators were found to be at least important to the role. All of the respondents (100%) indicated that the following tasks were either important or essential:

- Choose team members who are open to learning new skills

- Assess team members skills and needs

- Set goals and expectations for the team

- Advocate for the team in school

Although there was considerable consensus on most items, there was variability in the perceived importance of some tasks. For instance, facilitators varied in their impression of whether the facilitator should take on the Systems Manager role or whether this should be delegated. The IC training manual indicates that this role is expected to be delegated to another team member. A majority of the facilitators reported that it is important or essential for the facilitators to take on this role themselves (65%). However, 80% of respondents reported that it is important or essential to delegate this same role.

Facilitators' ratings were also variable for facilitation of meetings. *Facilitate the meeting yourself* was rated as important or essential by 67% of facilitators. The expected range for all facilitators is 58-75%. 'Having a co-facilitator' was important or essential to the role, according to 73% of raters (63-82% expected). Although there was generally consensus about *choosing team members who are open to learning new skills* and *choosing members who will be supportive of IC,* there was more variability in the perceived importance of *choosing team members who have expertise in data collection, intervention or curriculum*. About a third of facilitators felt this was not important. *Creating materials for case management* was of varying importance, as was *engaging in community-building and non-IC tasks*. A majority of facilitators (49-60%) felt that planning technical support for the district was not important. Facilitators were also split on the perceived importance of *assigning particularly difficult cases to themselves*; 35-46% of facilitators would say this was not important to the role.

Table 7.

*Abilities and Characteristics: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

| | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Have a capacity for relationship-building | 0 | [0, 0] | 12 | [9, 16] | 88 | [84, 91] |
| Be trustworthy | 0 | [0, 0] | 8 | [5, 11] | 92 | [89, 95] |
| Be able to take another person's perspective | 0 | [0, 0] | 10 | [6, 13] | 90 | [87, 94] |
| Be a reflective practitioner | 0 | [0, 0] | 13 | [10, 17] | 87 | [83, 90] |
| Have strong communication skills | 0 | [0, 0] | 11 | [7, 14] | 89 | [86, 93] |
| Manage and prioritize your time | 0 | [0,0] | 28 | [23, 33] | 72 | [67, 77] |
| Keep others (adults) on tasks | 1 | [0, 2] | 51 | [45, 56] | 48 | [43, 54] |
| Have strong organizational skills of physical space and materials | 4 | [2, 6] | 61 | [56, 67] | 35 | [30, 40] |
| Be able to multi-task in your role as facilitator | 2 | [1, 4] | 29 | [24, 34] | 69 | [64, 74] |
| Be flexible, as an attitude | 0 | [0, 0] | 28 | [23, 33] | 72 | [67, 77] |
| Be able to see the bigger picture | 0 | [0, 0] | 25 | [21, 30] | 75 | [70, 79 |
| Be able to break down tasks into smaller parts | 0 | [0, 0] | 35 | [30, 40] | 65 | [60, 70] |
| Receive negative feedback about IC | 0 | [0, 0] | 46 | [40, 51] | 54 | [49, 60] |
| Help others to reflect on their practices | 0 | [0, 0] | 25 | [20, 29] | 75 | [71, 80] |
| Be able to read other people as a team facilitator | 0 | [0, 0] | 44 | [39, 49] | 56 | [51, 61] |
| Be a self-starter | 1 | [0, 2] | 31 | [26, 36] | 67 | [62, 73] |
| Help team members to feel safe and certain | 1 | [0, 2] | 28 | [23, 33] | 71 | [66, 76] |
| Be willing to take professional risks | 1 | [0, 2] | 33 | [27, 38] | 66 | [61, 71] |
| Respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults | 1 | [0, 2] | 24 | [19, 29] | 75 | [70, 79] |
| Manage conflict between IC Teams and other programs | 4 | [2, 6] | 40 | [34, 45] | 57 | [51, 62] |
| Manage conflict between team members | 0 | [0, 0] | 40 | [34, 45] | 60 | [55, 66] |
| Be able to work with people with different personalities | 0 | [0, 0] | 15 | [11, 18] | 85 | [82, 89] |
| Help staff create and work towards a common goal | 0 | [0, 0] | 31 | [26, 36] | 69 | [64, 74] |
| Align program goals of IC with other school initiatives and vision | 1 | [0, 2] | 25 | [21, 30] | 73 | [69, 78] |

Table 8.

*Skills: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

| | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Manage and analyze data on the computer | 6 | [3, 9] | 77 | [73, 82] | 17 | [13, 21] |
| Have completed IC training in case management | 0 | [0, 0] | 13 | [10, 17] | 87 | [83, 90] |
| Have strong IC case management skills | 0 | [0, 0] | 22 | [17, 26] | 78 | [74, 83] |
| Have strong group facilitation/group process skills | 0 | [0, 0] | 29 | [24, 34] | 71 | [66, 76] |
| Have strong classroom management skills | 8 | [5, 11] | 64 | [59, 69] | 28 | [23, 33] |

**Administration contact**

Contact with the school-level administrators also emerged as critical components of the role of the IC facilitator. Facilitators found it essential that they *communicate with administrators regularly* (76-84%) and that they *discuss the sustainability and expectations of IC with an administrator* (76-81%). The remaining facilitators rated these tasks to be important to the role. Receiving a summative evaluation from the administrator was also important or essential to all but a small portion of facilitators.

**Training for self**

Consistent with the training expectations outlined in the IC manuals and research on the role, facilitators reported that receiving training for themselves was important or essential. This includes *collaborating with other facilitators* (100%), *participating in trainings and meetings* (99%), *engaging in individual professional development* (98%) and *attending networking meetings* (94%). This is a task that is only expected when a facilitator reaches an advanced level of training. More than two-thirds of facilitators (62-73%) are expected to rate that *reviewing the Level of Implementation Data* to inform team goals and for planning purposes was an essential task. When taking into account those that rate reviewing the LOI as important, the percent of anticipated respondents facilitators rose to 82-91%.

Table 9.

*Case Management Tasks: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

|  | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Model effective case management | 0 | [0, 0] | 19 | [15, 24] | 81 | [76, 85] |
| Engage in the problem solving process (as a case manager) | 0 | [0, 0] | 12 | [9, 16] | 88 | [84, 91] |
| Complete the Instructional Assessments for trained case managers | 20 | [15, 24] | 20 | [15, 24] | 61 | [56, 66] |
| Sit with case managers during meetings with consultees | 29 | [24, 34] | 48 | [43, 54] | 23 | [18, 27] |

Table 10.

*Team-Related Tasks: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

|  | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Choose or have influence over the choice of team members that will be supportive of IC | 7 | [4, 10] | 57 | [52, 63] | 35 | [30, 41] |
| Choose team members with expertise in data collection, intervention or curriculum | 37 | [31, 42] | 55 | [49, 60] | 9 | [6, 12] |
| Choose team members who are open to learning new skills | 0 | [0, 0] | 28 | [23, 33] | 72 | [67, 77] |
| Assess team members' skills and needs | 0 | [0, 0] | 45 | [40, 51] | 55 | [49, 60] |
| Set goals and expectations for the team | 0 | [0, 0] | 35 | [30, 41] | 65 | [59, 70] |
| Delegate meeting roles and responsibilities | 4 | [2, 6] | 54 | [48, 59] | 41 | [36, 47] |
| Facilitate the team meeting yourself | 33 | [28, 38] | 56 | [50, 61] | 11 | [8, 14] |
| Have a co-facilitator during meetings | 27 | [22, 32] | 56 | [50, 61] | 17 | [13, 21] |
| Cover classes so teacher/case manager can meet | 7 | [5, 10] | 43 | [38, 49] | 49 | [44, 55] |
| Provide coaching on team members' cases | 1 | [0, 2] | 38 | [33, 43] | 61 | [56, 66] |
| Facilitate IC Team meetings | 4 | [2, 6] | 45 | [40, 51] | 51 | [46, 57] |
| Provide non-evaluative feedback to team members | 0 | [0, 0] | 38 | [33, 43] | 62 | [57, 67] |
| Train new team members | 1 | [0, 2] | 20 | [15, 24] | 79 | [75, 84] |
| Plan tech support for the school district | 54 | [49, 60] | 35 | [29, 40] | 11 | [8, 15] |
| Provide on-going training for team members | 1 | [0, 2] | 22 | [17, 26] | 77 | [72, 81] |
| Provide on-going support to team members after they have been trained to take cases | 1 | [0, 2] | 24 | [20, 29] | 74 | [62, 73] |
| Fulfill Systems Manager role | 35 | [30, 41] | 48 | [42, 53] | 17 | [13, 21] |
| Delegate Systems Manager role | 20 | [15, 24] | 57 | [51, 62] | 23 | [19, 28] |
| Maintain IC Teams meeting climate | 0 | [0, 0] | 38 | [33, 43] | 62 | [57, 67] |
| Manage the team's schedule | 10 | [7, 13] | 46 | [41, 52] | 44 | [39, 49] |
| Distribute new cases | 10 | [7, 13] | 43 | [34, 45] | 48 | [55, 66] |
| Assign difficult cases or consultees to yourself | 40 | [35, 46] | 46 | [41, 52] | 13 | [10, 17] |
| Create material for case management | 25 | [20, 29] | 56 | [50, 61] | 20 | [15, 24] |
| Create material for training | 1 | [0, 2] | 54 | [48, 59] | 45 | [40, 51] |
| Complete paperwork and administrative tasks | 4 | [2, 6] | 48 | [42, 53] | 49 | [43, 54] |
| Encourage teachers to use IC | 1 | [0, 2] | 21 | [16, 25] | 78 | [74, 83] |
| Present to staff at the beginning of the year about IC Teams | 2 | [1, 4] | 31 | [26, 36] | 67 | [62, 72] |
| Provide regular, on-going training on IC to school staff | 2 | [1, 4] | 37 | [31, 42] | 61 | [56, 66] |
| Advocate for the team in school | 0 | [0,0] | 26 | [21, 31] | 74 | [69, 79] |
| Engage in community-building | 24 | [20, 29] | 51 | [46, 57] | 24 | [20, 29] |
| Engage in non-IC school-related tasks | 34 | [29, 39] | 49 | [43, 54] | 17 | [13, 21] |

Table 11.

*Administration Contact: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

|  | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Engage in district-level program development tasks | 8 | [5, 10] | 54 | [48, 59] | 39 | [33, 44] |
| Communicate with administrator regularly | 0 | [0, 0] | 20 | [16, 24] | 80 | [76, 84] |
| Discuss the sustainability and expectations of IC with administrator | 0 | [0, 0] | 19 | [14, 23] | 81 | [77, 86] |
| Present information about IC to administrator or school board | 5 | [3, 7] | 45 | [40, 50] | 50 | [45, 55] |
| Receive summative evaluation from administrator | 9 | [6, 12] | 60 | [55, 66] | 31 | [26, 36] |

Table 12.

*Training for Self: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

|  | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Attend and participate in facilitator training and meetings | 1 | [0, 2] | 29 | [24, 34] | 70 | [65, 75] |
| Attend networking/district-level facilitator meetings | 6 | [3, 9] | 36 | [31, 41] | 58 | [53, 63] |
| Collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions | 0 | [0, 0] | 33 | [28, 38] | 67 | [62, 72] |
| Engage in other professional development activities on my own to build my skills as a facilitator | 2 | [1, 4] | 40 | [34, 45] | 58 | [53, 63] |

Table 13.

*Implementation Measurement: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

| Item | Not Important | | Important | | Essential | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Complete Level of Implementation (LOI) end-of-year evaluation tasks | 10 | [7, 13] | 32 | [27, 37] | 59 | [53, 64] |
| Review Level of Implementation (LOI) data to inform team goals, planning, etc. | 8 | [5, 10] | 25 | [20, 30] | 68 | [62, 73] |
| Use ICAT Tools for data entry & feedback | 7 | [4, 10] | 37 | [20, 30] | 56 | [51, 61] |
| Coach others online | 41 | [36, 46] | 49 | [31, 42] | 10 | [6, 13] |
| Develop a support network for facilitators within your district | 4 | [2, 6] | 52 | [46, 57] | 45 | [39, 50] |

## Research Question 2: Changeability

What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs, and characteristics as not at all changeable, somewhat changeable or very changeable by training and experience?

In order to better understand how training and experience may influence the beliefs and characteristics deemed important to the facilitator role, participants were asked to indicate whether they believe various items were changeable through training and experience. For all but one item, the vast majority of facilitators reported that the characteristics and beliefs were somewhat to very changeable. *Trustworthiness* was rated as not changeable by 36-46% of participants; however an almost equal number felt this trait was somewhat changeable (40-51%). *Believing that IC can work* stood out as the item perceived to be very changeable by the most facilitators (74-83%).

Table 14.

*Changeability: Percent of Raters and 95% Confidence Intervals*

|  | Not at all changeable | | Somewhat changeable | | Very changeable | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI | % | 95% CI |
| Have a capacity for relationship building | 7 | [4, 10] | 67 | [62, 73] | 25 | [21, 30] |
| Be trustworthy | 41 | [36, 46] | 46 | [40, 51] | 13 | [10, 17] |
| Be able to take another person's perspective | 7 | [4, 10] | 64 | [59, 69] | 29 | [24, 34] |
| Be a reflective practitioner | 2 | [1, 4] | 29 | [24, 34] | 69 | [64, 74] |
| Believe that IC can work | 1 | [0, 2] | 22 | [17, 26] | 78 | [74, 83] |
| Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability | 4 | [2, 6] | 57 | [52, 63] | 39 | [34, 44] |
| Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort | 2 | [1, 4] | 72 | [67, 77] | 26 | [21, 31] |
| Believe that all staff have valuable expertise | 5 | [3, 7] | 45 | [39, 50] | 51 | [45, 56] |
| Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity | 2 | [1, 4] | 41 | [36, 46] | 57 | [51, 62] |
| Believe that team members' beliefs can be changed | 1 | [0, 2] | 51 | [45, 56] | 48 | [43, 54] |

## Research Question 3: Group Differences

Do IC Facilitators' ratings of importance and changeability differ significantly by

phase of implementation completed by the facilitators or years of experience as a

facilitator?

This question was addressed in two ways. Facilitators were dividing into groups

based on level of training, measured by the most advanced team they had led (phase 1, 2,

or 3). Analyses were repeated with facilitators grouped by experience level (Novice vs. Veteran).

**Phase**

To determine if there were differences in ratings due to facilitators' level of training, chi square tests of independence were run to compare groups of facilitators divided by most advanced team (phase). As explained in Chapter 3, the group of facilitators who had only led teams through Phase 1 was too small for inclusion in the chi square tests of independence. Those facilitators whose most advanced team reached Phase 2 and Phase 3 were compared for each item.

Table 15.

*Frequency of Most Advanced Phase Completed.*

| Most Advanced Phase | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| No Response | 1 | 1 |
| Phase 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Phase 2 | 26 | 31 |
| Phase 3 | 50 | 60 |

**Beliefs**

Ratings for one item from the Belief section of the survey were found to have a significant relationship with the most advanced phase that the facilitators had completed. The responses to the item *believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers* had a moderate relationship with training (Table 16): $\chi^2 (1, N = 76) = 4.948$, $p = .026$. The Cramer's V value for this relationship was .255. However, the significance of this test is in question, as one cell (25%) had an expected count less than 5. This exceeds the 20% recommendation for low cell counts and indicates that the

significance may be overestimated. Also, when the Benjamini-Hochberg correction is applied to adjust for false discoveries, the p-value for this finding exceeds the critical p-value for the adjustment ($p_x$ = .01). The null hypotheses should not be rejected in these cases.

Table 17 shows that the result for the item, *believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability*, is: $\chi^2$ (2, N = 75) = 7.062, p = .029. The Cramer's V statistic suggested that this was a strong relationship, with a value of .307. One cell (16.7%) had an expected count less than 5. Because fewer than 20% of the cells had a low cell count, the significance value was considered a valid estimate. The critical p-value when the Benjamini-Hochberg Method is applied is $p_x$ = .011. The original finding is greater than the critical p-value, indicating this finding is likely a false positive.

Table 16.

*'Believe in the Importance of Working in a Non-evaluative Capacity with Teachers' by Phase.*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 4 | 11 | 4.948 | 0.026* | 0.255 |
| | Expected Count | 3.8 | 7.2 | 11.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 46 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.2 | 42.8 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05. One cell has an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.8

Table 17

*'Believe that Working Hard has More Influence on Success than Ability' by Phase.*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 6 | 2 | 8 | 7.062 | 0.029* | 0.307 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Expected Count | 2.7 | 5.3 | 8.0 |
| Important | Count | 10 | 27 | 37 |
|  | Expected Count | 12.3 | 24.7 | 37.0 |
| Essential | Count | 9 | 21 | 30 |
|  | Expected Count | 10.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 |
|  | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 |

*Note.* *p < .05.  One cell  has an expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected

count is 2.7

### Abilities

Ratings on one item from the Abilities section, *be able to multi-task in your role*

*as facilitator*, were found to be significantly related to training $\chi^2$ (2, N = 76) = 5.873, p

= .053.  The strength of the association was moderate, with a Cramer's V statistic of .278

(Table 18).  Two cells (33.3%) had expected counts less than 5.  The minimum expected

count is .68. This suggested that the significance may be overestimated.  Again, the

Benjamini-Hochberg correction renders this finding non-significant and the null

hypothesis cannot be rejected. The null hypotheses should not be rejected in these cases.

The critical p-value is .002.

### Skills

The relationship between ratings on one item in the skill category, *manage and*

*analyze data on the computer*, approach statistical significance $\chi^2$ (2, N = 76) = 5.587, p

= .061. The Cramer's V value of .271 indicated a moderate association.  However, three

cells (50%) had expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 1.71.  The

significance value was likely overestimated, due to the large number of cells with low

expected counts.  This finding is also non-significant when the Benjamini-Hochberg

Method for addressing false discoveries is applied ($p_x$ = .001).

Table 18.

*'Be Able to Multi-task in Your Role as Facilitator' by Phase*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5.873 | 0.053 | 0.278 |
| | Expected Count | .7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 9 | 20 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.2 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 39 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.5 | 35.5 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76 | | | |

*Note.* Three cells have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .7.

Table 19.

*'Manage and Analyze Data on the Computer' by Phase.*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5.587 | 0.061 | 0.271 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 23 | 34 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.5 | 37.5 | 57.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 1 | 13 | 14 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 9.2 | 14.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* Three cells have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is

1.7.

**Team-related tasks**

Ratings for one item, *maintain IC Teams meeting climate* in the team-related tasks

section was found to have a significant relationship with training, as measured by most

advanced-phased team led: $\chi^2 (1, N = 76) = 3.614$, p = .057. The relationship was

moderate, as evidenced by the Cramer's V statistic of .218. When the Benjamini-

Hochberg Method was applied, the finding exceeded the critical p-value of $p_x` = .002$.

Therefore, this result is no longer considered significant.

Table 20.

*'Maintain IC Teams Meeting Climate' by Phase.*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|---------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 13 | 14 | 27 | 3.614 | 0.057 | 0.218 |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 36 | 49 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.8 | 32.2 | 49.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

**Changeability**

Facilitator's ratings of changeability on the item *believe that all staff have valuable expertise* was significantly different by phase $\chi^2$ (2, N = 76) = 6.087, p = .048 (Table 20). The relationship was of moderate strength (Cramer's V= .283). However, the significance was likely overestimated because two cells (33.3%) had expected counts less than 5. The minimum expected count is .68. Here the critical p-value for the Benjamini-Hochberg Method was $p_x` = .01$. The finding exceeds this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The relationship between ratings on *believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability* and phase was also significant $\chi^2$ (2, N = 75) = 8.203, p = .017 (Table 21). Again, two cells (33.3%) had expected counts less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1. The significance of this relationship was also likely overestimated. The critical p-value for the Benjamini-Hochberg Method is $p_x` = .005$ and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Table 21.

*'Believe that All Staff have Valuable Expertise' by Phase.*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6.087 | 0.048* | 0.283 |
| | Expected Count | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 14 | 20 | 34 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.6 | 22.4 | 34.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 10 | 30 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.7 | 26.3 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05.  Three cells have an expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is .7.

Table 22.

*'Believe that Working Hard has More Influence on Success than Ability' by Phase.*

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8.203 | 0.017* | 0.331 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 15 | 25 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.3 | 26.7 | 40.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 7 | 25 | 32 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.7 | 21.3 | 32.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05.  Three cells have an expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 1.

**Experience Level**

Ratings for each item were next analyzed for a relationship with level of experience.  Facilitators were divided into two groups, Novice and Veteran, based on their self-reported years of experience.  Facilitators with zero to three years of experience were grouped together as novices.  Veterans include facilitators with four to 20 years of experience.  The decision to form groups using years of experience was made based on a review of the IC training materials and literature (Gravois et al., 2007; Rosenfield &

Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012), as facilitators generally receive the complete training by the time they have three years of experience in the role. Novice facilitators make up 43% of the respondents (N= 36) and Veterans make up the remaining 57% (N= 47).  Chi square tests of independence were run for all 99-survey items.  A significant relationship was identified for eight items and two items had relationships with experience level that approached statistical significance.

**Knowledge**

Responses to two items from the knowledge section of the survey were found to have significant relationships with facilitator experience level.  Ratings on the item *know best practice in instruction* was significantly related to experience level (Table 23) $\chi^2$ (1, N $= 83) = 3.871$, p $= .049$. The strength of the relationship was moderate, as evidenced by the Cramer's V statistic of .216. The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x^{'} =$ .014, which is less than the finding.  Therefore the finding is non-significant.

Ratings on the item *know about change process* were also significantly related to experience level (Table 24) $\chi^2$ (2, N $= 83) = 7.929$, p $= .019$. The Cramer's V value of .309 indicated a strong relationship. For this item, the critical p-value for the Benjamini-Hochberg Method to address false discoveries was $p_x^{'} = .007$.  The original p-value exceeded this and the finding was no longer considered significant.

Table 23.

*'Know Best Practice in Instruction' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 17 | 23 | 3.871 | 0.049* | 0.216 |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 13.0 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 30 | 30 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 34.0 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |

| | | | | | Chi | | Cramer's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05

Table 24.

*'Know about Change Process' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7.929 | 0.019* | 0.309 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 17 | 9 | 26 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 14.7 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 37 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.3 | 31.7 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05. Three cells have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is

.4.

**Abilities**

One Abilities item, *have strong communication skills* was significantly related to facilitator experience level (Table 25) $\chi^2 (1, N = 83) = 4.865$, p = .027.  This relationship was one of moderate strength (Cramer's V= .242). One cell (25%) has an expected cell count of less than 5.  This violated the allowable parameter of 20% of cells with a low expected count; therefore the statistical significance of this relationship is in question and may be an overestimate. The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x` = .002$.  The original finding exceeded this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Table 25.

*'Have Strong Communication Skills' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 2 | 9 | 4.865 | 0.027* | 0.242 |
| | Expected Count | 3.9 | 5.1 | 9.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 29 | 45 | 74 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 32.1 | 41.9 | 74.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |

| Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 |

*Note.* *p < .05.  One cell has an expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 3.9.

### Skills

*Have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills* was significantly related to facilitator experience level (Table 26) $\chi^2$ (1, N = 83) = 5.078, p = .024 and the relationship was moderate (Cramer's V = .24).  The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x$ ` = .01.  The original finding exceeded this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Table 26.

*'Have Strong Instructional Consultation Case Management Skills' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 12 | 6 | 18 | 5.078 | 0.024* | 0.24 |
| | Expected Count | 7.8 | 10.2 | 18.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 41 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 28.2 | 36.8 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

### Team-related tasks

Facilitators' ratings of importance for the item *cover classes so teacher/case manager can meet* had a significant relationship with experience level (Table X):  $\chi^2$ (2, N = 81) = 6.847, p = .033. The Cramer's V statistic for the chi square analysis indicated a moderate relationship between the variables. Two cells (33.3%) in this chi square test had expected counts less than 5. The percent of cells with a low expected count is over 20%, which may indicate that the significance of the relationship is overestimated. The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x$ ` = .001.  The original finding exceeded this

value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Ratings of importance for *plan tech*

*support for the school district*' was also significantly related to experience level with a

relationship of moderate strength: Cramer's V= .291; Table X:  $\chi^2$ (2, N = 81) = 6.366, p

= .041. One cell (16.7%) has a low expected cell count; however because it does not

exceed the 20% parameter, the statistical significance is considered a valid estimate.

However, the Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x^{'}$ = .003.  The original finding

exceeded this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The relationship between

*assess team members* skills and needs' and facilitator experience approached significance

(Table X): $\chi^2$ (1, N = 82) = 3.563, p = .059.  This relationship was also moderate:

Cramer's V= .208. The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x^{'}$ = .004.  The original

finding exceeded this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

**Implementation measurement**

A moderate relationship approaching statistical significance *between uses ICAT*

*tools for data entry and feedback* and experience level was found (Table 30) $\chi^2$ (2, N =

82) = 5.629, p = .060. However, two cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. This

exceeds the allowable 20% limit on low expected cells.  The statistical significance of

this relationship may be overestimated here. Because the result was not significant, the

Benjamini-Hochberg Method was not applied

Table 27.

*'Cover Classes So Teacher/case manager Can Meet' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6.847 | 0.033* | 0.291 |
| | Expected Count | 2.5 | 3.5 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 19 | 16 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 20.3 | 35.0 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Essential | Count | 15 | 25 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.8 | 23.2 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05.  Two cells have an expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 2.5.

Table 28.

*'Plan Tech Support for the School District' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 17 | 27 | 44 | 6.366 | 0.041* | 0.28 |
| | Expected Count | 18.5 | 25.5 | 44.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 12 | 28 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.8 | 16.2 | 28.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 1 | 8 | 9 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.8 | 5.2 | 9.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05. One cell have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.78.

Table 29.

*'Assess Team Members' Skills and Needs' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 20 | 17 | 37 | 3.563 | 0.059 | 0.208 |
| | Expected Count | 15.8 | 21.2 | 37.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 30 | 45 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 25.8 | 45.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table 30.

*'Use ICAT Tools for Data Entry and Feedback' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not | Count | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5.629 | 0.06 | 0.262 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Expected Count | 2.6 | 3.4 | 6.0 |
| Important | Count | 18 | 12 | 30 |
| | Expected Count | 13.2 | 16.8 | 30.0 |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 31 | 46 |
| | Expected Count | 20.2 | 25.8 | 46.0 |
| Total | Count | 36 | 46 | 82 |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 46.0 | 82.0 |

*Note*. 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 2.63.

**Changeability**

A strong, significant relationship between ratings of changeability on *believe that all staff have valuable expertise* and experience level was revealed in this chi square test of independence (Table 31) $\chi^2$ (2, N = 83) = 8.074, p = .018 (Cramer's V= .312). Two cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5, indicating that the statistical significance may be overestimated.  The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x$ = .005.  The original finding exceeded this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. A significant relationship of moderate strength was found between ratings of changeability on 'believe that team members' beliefs can be changed' and facilitator experience level (Table 32) $\chi^2$ (2, N = 83) = 6.436, p = .040 (Cramer's V= .278). However, two cells (33.3%) have expected count less than five.  Again, this suggests that the statistical significance may be overestimated.  The Benjamini-Hochberg critical p-value was $p_x$ = .01.  The original finding exceeded this value and the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Table 31.

*'Believe That All Staff Have Valuable Expertise' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8.074 | 0.018* | 0.312 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 2.3 | 4.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 21 | 16 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.0 | 21.0 | 37.0 | | | |
| Very | Count | 12 | 30 | 42 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| changeable | Expected Count | 18.2 | 23.8 | 42.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05. Two cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.73.

Table 32.

*'Believe That Team Member's Beliefs Can Be Changed' by Experience Level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6.436 | 0.04* | 0.278 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 23 | 19 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.2 | 23.8 | 42.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 12 | 28 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.3 | 22.7 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* *p < .05. Two cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Data analysis for question three revealed few group differences in rating patterns. Many of the significant relations were the result of chi square tests with violated assumptions for cell count. In addition, the significance was further called into question when an adjustment was applied to address the large number of concurrent tests that were run. In the end, none of the tests maintained the required significance level in the final analysis. In other words, there is no evidence that there are group differences based on experience level (novice vs. veteran) or training (phase) in facilitators' ratings of importance or changeability of the survey items.

**Supplemental Analyses**

Facilitators generally rated most of the items as important or essential and there were no significant group differences in rating patterns. In order to better understand the

most critical components of the job, the items were ordered by the percentage of

facilitators who rated the item as essential (Table 33).

Table 33.

*Items Ranked by Percent of Facilitators Giving an Essential Rating.*

| Category | Item | % Essential |
|---|---|---|
| K | Know IC process/philosophy | 99 |
| CA | Be trustworthy | 92 |
| CA | Be able to take another person's perspective | 90 |
| CA | Have strong communication skills | 89 |
| CA | Have a capacity for relationship-building | 88 |
| CM | Engage in the problem solving process (as a case manager) | 88 |
| CA | Be a reflective practitioner | 87 |
| S | Have completed IC training in case management | 87 |
| B | Believe IC can work | 86 |
| CA | Be able to work with people with different personalities | 84 |
| K | Know about team dynamics and team functioning | 84 |
| B | Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers | 82 |
| CM | Model effective case management | 81 |
| K | Know principles of learning and behavior for children | 81 |
| AD | Discuss the sustainability and expectations of IC with administrator | 78 |
| S | Have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills | 78 |
| TRT | Train new team members | 78 |
| AD | Communicate with administrator regularly | 77 |
| TRT | Create material for training | 77 |
| TRT | Encourage teachers to use IC | 77 |
| TRT | Provide on-going training to team members | 76 |
| CA | Be able to see the bigger picture | 75 |
| CA | Respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults | 75 |
| CA | Help others to reflect on their practices | 74 |
| CA | Align program goals of IC with other school initiatives and vision | 74 |
| TRT | Provide on-going support to team members after they have been trained to take cases | 74 |
| CA | Manage and prioritize your time | 72 |
| CA | Be flexible, as an attitude | 72 |
| K | Know best practices in instruction | 72 |
| TRT | Advocate for the team in school | 72 |

| CA | Help team members to feel safe and certain | 71 |
|---|---|---|
| S | Have strong group facilitation/group process skills | 71 |
| TRT | Choose team members who are open to learning new skills | 71 |
| AD | Receive summative evaluation from administrator(s) | 70 |
| B | Believe that all school staff have valuable expertise | 70 |
| TS | Attend and participate in facilitator training and meetings | 70 |
| CA | Be able to multi-task in your role as facilitator | 69 |
| CA | Help staff create and work towards a common goal | 69 |
| CA | Be a self-starter | 68 |
| K | Know change process | 68 |
| CA | Be willing to take professional risks | 66 |
| TS | Collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions | 66 |
| CA | Be able to break down tasks into smaller parts | 65 |
| IM | Review Level of Implementation (LOI) data to inform team goals, planning, etc | 65 |
| TRT | Present to staff at the beginning of the year about Instructional Consultation Teams | 65 |
| K | Know principles of learning and behavior for adults | 64 |
| TRT | Set goals and expectations for the team | 64 |
| TRT | Maintain IC Teams meeting climate | 61 |
| TRT | Provide non-evaluative feedback to team members | 61 |
| CM | Complete Instructional Assessments for trained case managers | 60 |
| TRT | Manage conflict between team members | 60 |
| TRT | Provide coaching on team members' cases | 60 |
| TRT | Provide regular, on-going training on IC to school staff | 60 |
| IM | Complete Level of Implementation (LOI) end-of-year evaluation tasks. | 58 |
| TS | Attend networking/district-level facilitator meetings | 58 |
| TS | Engage in other professional development activities on my own to build my skills as a facilitator | 58 |
| CA | Manage conflict between IC Teams and other programs | 57 |
| CA | Be able to read other people (e.g. read social cues; social insight) as a team facilitator | 55 |
| IM | Use ICAT Tools for data entry and feedback | 55 |
| CA | Receive negative feedback about IC | 54 |
| TRT | Choose team members with expertise in data collection, interventions, or curriculum | 54 |
| TRT | Assess team members' skills and needs | 54 |
| TRT | Facilitate IC Team Meetings | 51 |
| CA | Keep others (adults) on tasks | 48 |
| TRT | Cover classes so teacher/case manager can met | 48 |
| TRT | Complete paperwork and administrative tasks | 48 |
| TRT | Distribute new cases | 47 |

| IM | Develop a support network for facilitators within your district | 45 |
|---|---|---|
| TRT | Manage the team's schedule | 43 |
| TRT | Delegate meeting roles and responsibilities | 42 |
| B | Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability | 37 |
| CA | Have strong organizational skills of physical space and materials | 35 |
| K | Know content/curriculum (e.g. academic standards; reading, writing, math content, etc) | 30 |
| AD | Present information about IC to administrators or school board | 29 |
| TRT | Engage in community-building activities (e.g. participate in field day, etc) | 24 |
| CM | Sit with case managers during meetings with consultees | 23 |
| TRT | Delegate the Systems Manager Role | 23 |
| TRT | Create material for case management | 19 |
| S | Manage and analyze data on the computer | 17 |
| TRT | Have a co-facilitator during meetings | 17 |
| TRT | Fulfill Systems Manager Role | 17 |
| TRT | Engage in non-IC school-related tasks (e.g. proctor standardized tests; bus/hall/cafeteria duty; etc.) | 17 |
| TRT | Assign difficult cases or consultees to yourself | 13 |
| TRT | Facilitate the team meeting yourself | 11 |
| TRT | Plan tech support for the school district | 11 |
| IM | Coach others online | 10 |
| B | Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort | 6 |

*Note. AD= Administration contact; B. = Belief; CA = Characteristics and abilities; CM = Case management; IM= Implementation measurement; K= knowledge; S= Skills; TS= Training for self; TRT= Team-related tasks.*

**Chapter 5: Discussion**

Chapter 4 presented the detailed results of this study designed to extend the understanding by facilitators of the perceived importance and changeability through training and experience of several beliefs, tasks, skills, facilitator characteristics and abilities, and types knowledge reported in the literature (Burkhouse, 2012; McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012). Chapter 5 explores the conclusions drawn from these results in the context of the training and research literature, provides a discussion of the limitations of this research and offers suggestions for future directions for the study of IC Teams facilitation.

**Who is the IC Facilitator?**

The demographic and contextual data helps to describe the facilitator and provides information about the shared experiences and background many of the facilitators bring to the role. Demographic information is consistent with the sample of facilitators that participated in Vaganek's (2012) job analysis. This lends some confidence to the data, despite a low response rate. In general, the responding IC facilitators are largely female and works primarily in an elementary school setting. The percentage of time allocated to IC facilitation varies considerably and may reflect different interpretations of the role for different states, school districts and individual school buildings.

Facilitators generally have additional roles and responsibilities in their schools, including but not limited to teaching and facilitating other types of teams. In many cases, facilitators may split their time among other teams and interventions that may have different values and philosophies, some of which may be in contrast to the tenants of IC

Teams. This contextual factor is especially relevant, as facilitators rated the ability to build relationships and participate in community-building activities as important. Ratings on the survey suggest that these non-IC-related tasks and roles that help the school run smoothly and build community are important to the participants.

The years of experience varies widely in the group of respondents, from zero to 20 years, but about half of the participating facilitators had completed all levels of required training, leading a team through Phase 3. Some facilitators went on to complete advanced training and then coach novices, or provide support to their school districts.

Prior to taking on the role of IC Teams facilitator, respondents generally worked as general education or special education teachers, although a few bring unique experiences in terms of previous or concurrent roles. Most facilitators have training in education, with only a few with backgrounds or degrees in psychology or other areas. A few facilitators had previous or current experience as a school psychologist, school counselor, or speech-language pathologist. One participant reported that he or she is an administrator.

The data and conclusions drawn from the survey results reflect a population of teachers who also act in a facilitator capacity. According to Sylvia Rosenfield, (personal communication, October 6, 2015) the creator of IC and a program developer for IC Teams, the role of the IC consultant was originally designed for a school psychologist. However, the majority of IC facilitators in this study had training and experience as teachers. This is a critical factor to understanding the perception of the role. The original vision was a school psychologist with an understanding of and training in behavior modification, learning, group process, team leadership, data-based decision-making, and

problem-solving.  The role was designed to bring psychologists into the classroom; to give them access to and a better understanding of curriculum, academic skills, and making a match between tasks, instruction, and student skills and needs.

However, in practice, teachers have fulfilled the role. This is significant because of the differences in training, experiences and philosophies that may come with the different degrees and job responsibilities. School psychologists are required to have a minimum of a specialist degree in order to practice in the schools.  As a result, school psychologists are likely older than bachelor's-level teachers when they begin their careers in the schools.  This difference in age and as a result, life experiences, may also contribute to differences in the role when carried out by individuals with different professional training and experience. The skills, characteristics, knowledge, beliefs and tasks that are important from the perspective of a classroom teacher may differ from those originally put forth by program developers in some ways. Trainers and program developers may need to consider how facilitators in practice, with training and experience as teachers, may differ from the population who was originally intended to carry out the role. Training may need to be adjusted to reflect the differences in the intended and actual facilitator populations. As teacher training programs continue to produce educators with more training on assessment and data-based decision making, the role of the facilitator may evolve to reflect the changing role of the teacher.

Perhaps equally as important as the demographic information collected about the IC facilitator is the information that remains unknown.  The data collected did not provide information about the geographic location of the participating facilitator.  IC Teams is implemented across nine states: Maryland, Delaware, Michigan, Indiana,

Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia (ICAT, 2015). Current

data do not indicate whether the participating facilitators were evenly distributed across

states or school districts.  Perceptions of the role may vary by district or state, depending

on the expectations of the role in each location.

**Research Question 1**

Research question 1 is: What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that

would likely rate beliefs, knowledge, abilities, skills, tasks, and characteristics reported in

previous studies as related to the IC Team facilitator role (e.g. McMahon, 1998;

Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012) as not important, important, or essential?

Data from Question 1 provided a snapshot of the participant's ratings as well as a

way to extrapolate the expected ratings if all facilitators in the population participated.

Tables 5 to 13 in Chapter 4 present the frequency of ratings for each item as well as the

95% confidence interval calculated to estimate the ratings of the population. It is

important to note again that the range of facilitators likely to give a particular rating was

based on the portion of the population who responded.  No information was available

regarding the non-responders.  However, it is very possible that the responders and non-

responders differ in consequential ways.  Previous action research conducted by a group

of IC facilitators revealed perceptions among the staff in one school division that some

facilitators were more invested and engaged in the role than others (Neall & Cassatta,

2009).

The Essentials for IC Facilitations**:** Facilitators were asked to rate items related to

their jobs on a 3 point scale of Not Important, Important, and Essential.  The survey

instrument was created by reviewing the available IC literature, IC training materials, and

previous research on IC and general facilitation (Burkhouse, 2012; McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012). When the study was first proposed, the rating scale for importance included five points, from not important to essential. Based on feedback from dissertation committee members and expert trainers in IC Teams, the rating scale was revised to include only three points. This was done to clarify the response options and to guide respondents to think about the differences between important and essential items. When combined together, the majority of beliefs, abilities, characteristics, tasks, skills, and types of knowledge were rated as important or essential. In other words, the survey items reflected accurately the important components taught in the extensive training that facilitators receive. Many of the survey items used language common in the IC literature and trainings. Facilitators who have completed even just the most basic parts of their training should be familiar with the terms and values of the program. Ratings may reflect an element of social desirability, if respondents felt some pressure to respond in a way consistent with their training and job expectations.

However, when important and essential were taken as separate and distinct ratings, some more interesting patterns in ratings were revealed. Beyond concluding that many of the expected statements were indeed perceived as important or essential, the survey findings reveal the factors that facilitators feel are critical to their own role. All survey items and the percent of participants who rated each as essential is presented in Table 32 in Chapter 4.

When the items are read in descending order, a picture of IC Teams emerges that is generally consistent with IC literature and the training materials, with some interesting

exceptions (Gravois, Gickling, & Rosenfield, 2007; Rosenfield, 2014; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). First and foremost, facilitators overwhelmingly agree that *knowing the IC process and philosophy* was essential. Facilitators felt they must also *be trustworthy* and capable *of taking another person's perspective*, according to both the literature and active facilitators.

Facilitators' ratings of the perceived importance of the survey items also fit with previous research and literature on general team facilitation and specifically IC Teams facilitation. The Consultation and Interdisciplinary Relations Workgroup from the *Competencies Conference: Future Directions in Education and Credentialing in Professional Psychology* (Arredondo et al., 2004) reported on the implementation skills considered necessary in consultation, such as facilitation of problem-solving time management, setting and meeting deadlines, allocating resources, communication, client management, and process planning in which a model is used to introduce, intervene and evaluate the project. The following skills and knowledge were reported by them to be necessary to solve problems and facilitate change:

- Knowledge of: needs assessments; system, group and individual behavior; problem-solving models, change models; ethical and legal issues

- Skills in: critical thinking; determining needs generating hypothesis; creating solutions; selecting strategies; evaluating outcomes; and systematic examination of data

- Values that: empower the client; consider stake-holders' interests; display objectivity and support the use of evidence-based strategies.

Several essential items overlap with Arredondo et al.'s (2004) conclusions on the necessary knowledge, skills and values necessary for implementation. Facilitators overwhelmingly agreed that knowledge of a problem-solving model, in this case *know IC process/philosophy* (99%) was essential. Both the Arredondo et al. (2004) and the survey participants agreed that it is essential to *know about team functioning and group process* (84%). Regarding values, facilitators empower the client, in this case the team members and consultees, by *believing in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity* (82%). The consideration of stakeholders' interests was also found to be necessary, as facilitators felt it was essential to discuss sustainability and expectations of IC with administrators in their schools (78%).

Klimes-Dougan et al., (2009) studied the experience, personality traits, beliefs, coping skills and school climate of Early Risers' practitioners called Family Advocates (FA) who were tasked with bringing together resources for families to boost young children's social-emotional and academic success. Personality characteristics, in addition to beliefs and school climate factors, were found to be related to fidelity of implementation of the prevention program in the study. Klimes-Dougan et al. concluded that their results speak to the need for formal or informal assessment of personality and belief systems when hiring practitioners to implement interventions and innovations. Results of the current study support the need for attention to the personal characteristics and beliefs of the IC facilitator, as several beliefs and traits were rated as essential by more than 75% of facilitators, including:

- trustworthiness,
- perspective-taking,

- relationship-building,

- reflection

- believing that IC can work,

- believing in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity.

The cut-point of at least 75% was selected in order to be consistent with the findings from Burkhouse's 2012 Delphi study, to which the results of this work are compared.

Rosenfield and Gravois (1996) outlined several tasks and skills thought to be necessary for the facilitator role (Table 1). These tasks can be categorized into three groups: (1) tasks facilitating the functioning of the team, (2) assisting individual team members to function as case managers, and (3) creating a favorable school environment. Current facilitators continued to rate several of the same tasks and skills as essential. The current study revealed that *knowledge about team dynamics and team functioning* (84%) continues to be essential and is consistent with program developers' essentials skills of team facilitation and understanding group functioning.

Rosenfield and Gravois (1996) stated that being able to build trust and confidence of participants was critical. This remained true, as participants reported it was essential to *be trustworthy* (92%); *be able to take another person's perspective* (90%); and *have a capacity for relationship-building* (88%). Skills in demonstration continued to be essential, as measured by ratings of m*odel effective case management* (81%). *Training new team members* was also an essential task (78%), consistent with previous literature. Although ratings specifically related to confronting conflict did not make the 75% cutoff, facilitators reported that it was essential to *respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults* (75%); and *be able to work with people with different personalities* (84%).

The IC Teams Facilitator Training Manual (Gravois et al., 2007) outlines adapted and expanded skills and tasks required for facilitators in addition to the original skills and tasks laid out in Rosenfield and Gravois' book (1996) (Table 2). Current data supported several of the additional skills listed in the training manual. The training manual added that it is critical to work with the principal and key staff to integrate IC into school functioning and to consult with the principal. Survey results indicated that facilitators also believe it is essential to *communicate with administration regularly* (77%). Regarding the requirement to provide ongoing training to develop members' skills, ratings for the item *provide on-going training to team members* (76%) support this as a primary task and function. The training manual also includes case consulting as an essential part of the role and current facilitators agree, as 78% rated the item *have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills* as essential.

Surprisingly, engaging in program evaluation tasks and receiving external support were not considered essential by 75% or more of participating facilitators. These tasks are outlined in the training manual as necessary. It is not clear why facilitators' perceptions of these tasks do not align with program developers' vision.

There are some similarities in the essential tasks, characteristics, skills, beliefs and knowledge between the facilitators' ratings and core competencies of consultants that emerged from the Burkhouse (2012) Delphi study of the core competencies for consultation. Results from two iterations of her survey administered to consultation researchers and trainers indicated 35 essential core competencies for consultants. Burkhouse highlighted the core competencies that were reported by at least 75% of participants. The top four characteristics were from Burkhouse's study were:

- Capacity to form quality relationships

- Trustworthiness

- Perspective-taking skills

- Acting as a reflective practitioner

These same statements were also rated as essential by a strong majority of IC facilitators. *Trustworthiness* was essential according to 92% of participants. Ninety percent of participates rated the *ability to take another person's perspective* as essential. Percentages of essential ratings for *capacity to build relationships* and *acting as a reflective practitioner* were 87 and 88%, respectively. Ratings of changeability also had overlap with the core competencies of consultants, which are described below.

Trustworthiness emerged as an essential item across facilitation research; this is no surprise considering the importance of trust in school communities in general (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Trust facilitates relationships in schools between administrators and staff, teachers with other teachers, teachers with parents, and teachers with students. Trust in schools has several important benefits. When school staff trust each other, they are able to take risks and try new things. This is critical to the change process and to the implementation of interventions, such as IC Teams. Trust helps school staff to take on the challenges they are presented daily.

**Gaps Between Literature and Results for Research Question 1**

Some of the survey items were rated essential by fewer facilitators than might be expected, based on a review of the training materials and literature (Gravois, Gickling, & Rosenfield, 2007; Rosenfield, 2014; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). For example, only 78% of facilitators rated *train new team members* as an essential task and 60% rated

*provide coaching* as essential. IC Teams is a train-the-trainer model (Rosenfield, 2014). The original, primary function of the facilitator is to train and coach team members so that they can act as consultants within a consultee-centered consultation relationship with a teacher.  Training team members was rated essential by a majority, but not as many facilitators as might be expected considering that it is one of the most primary job function outlined in the IC literature. This may be a reflection of the evolution of the role. School districts typically send team members to IC Teams training and the facilitators may no longer be the primary trainer.  Although ongoing support and coaching is still expected, the ratings in this study may suggest that the primary responsibilities of the facilitator is to run the team meetings, take cases, and keep the team functioning rather than training team members.

Assessing team members' needs should be inherent in planning training and on-going coaching; however only 54% rated this task as essential to facilitation. Ongoing training and professional development for the facilitator is another value of IC Teams. However, only 58% reported *attend networking/district-level meetings* and *engage in other professional development* were essential. While these tasks were important to a large number of facilitators, they are considered essential by IC program developers and trainers.  The survey responses highlight a gap between the expectations laid out in training and facilitators" perceptions of the role.

Facilitators' ratings related to implementation measurement were also lower than might be expected. IC Teams is conceptualized as an innovation that requires a systems-change within the school district and school building in order to reach full implementation.  However, only 58% of facilitators rated it essential to *know the change*

*process*.  IC Teams teaches case managers how to use data and assist teachers in using data to address academic and behavioral concerns in the classroom.  The same principals are applied to data-based needs assessment, goal-setting and decision making for the IC team.  Facilitators are trained and provided on-going technical support in order to assess team members' needs and evaluate the team's progress.  Surprisingly, only 65% of facilitators felt it was essential to *review the end-of-year Level of Implementation (LOI) data in order to set goals for the team* for the next school year.  Even fewer facilitators (58%) felt it was essential to *complete the LOI and use ICAT Tools to track team data* (55%).  LOI completion and analysis is an expected function as a school implementing IC Teams.

This raises interesting questions for program developers and trainers.  It is possible that continued training is necessary to impart the importance of the LOI. Facilitators may benefit from specific, targeted training in ways to use the LOI data so it is relevant to their teams and schools. It is also possible that the LOI does not fully meet the needs of the school-based teams, resources are not allocated appropriately to allow for more time to be spent analyzing the end-of-year data or setting goals, or that other systems or personnel issues are interfering.  Adaptations to the LOI may be necessary to that facilitators are able to make good use of the data and use it for training and goal setting. Another possibility is that facilitators are relying on some other form of evaluation and feedback to gauge their team's progress and needs.

A majority of participants reported that it was important or essential *to fulfill the systems manager role*, even though the training manual specifically advocates for delegating these responsibilities to another team member (Gravois, Rosenfield, &

Gickling, 2002). The systems manager is primarily responsible for collecting new requests for assistance and maintaining records of case data, such as stage of the problem-solving process and dates of meetings between case managers and consultees (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). The role may be adapted by facilitators to meet the needs of their particular team (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996), such as permanently assigning the role to a team member or rotating the role. Facilitators' ratings may suggest a need to further adapt the role to meet the needs of the current school environment. This item was added because of a surprising finding that came out of Vaganek's (2012) job analysis interviews. Some facilitators reported in their interviews that they take on the System Manager role because they have more flexibility in their schedule as a facilitator compared to the teachers on the team (Vaganek, 2012). The survey data confirms that facilitators are in some way involved in the systems manager role, either in fulfilling the role or delegating it; however the extent to which this role is assigned to others or if it has become an unofficial task of the IC facilitator is not clear.

Another unexpected conclusion from Vaganek's (2012) interviews was the importance of participating in non-IC tasks as a means of building community at the school and helping the school to complete other vital functions, such as standardized testing or supervising children. The items *engage in community-building activities (e.g. participate in field day, etc.)* and *engage in non-IC school-related tasks (e.g. proctor standardized tests; bus/hall/cafeteria duty; etc.)* were added to the survey to explore whether or not these activities were important to other facilitators or if they were isolated tasks that were specific to the schools and facilitators who participated in the interviews. In fact, about half of facilitators found both community-building and non-IC school-

related tasks to be important. When one considers the change process and the role of relationship building in IC Teams, it makes sense that facilitators would value their participation in the school community. In order to promote utilization, facilitators likely need to make contact with a variety of teachers and remain visible and approachable. Participation in non-IC tasks may be a function of facilitators' unusual roles and the amount of flexibility for irregular tasks such as proctoring tests and supervising children during arrival, dismissal and lunch.

Two items were included in the survey to address facilitators' views on growth versus fixed mindsets. However, the pattern of ratings does not lend itself to easy interpretation. A majority of facilitators reported that it was important or essential to hold the belief that working hard has more of an influence on success than ability. This finding was expected, given IC Teams focus on looking at the task and instruction and moving beyond focusing only on the skills or deficits within the student. However, facilitators were split in their ratings when asked about the importance of believing that ability has more influence on success than effort. Surprisingly, about half of them rated it important to hold this belief, although only 6% found this belief to be essential.

By looking at the 'essentials', stakeholders may be able to narrow down the field of critical skills, abilities, characteristics, beliefs, and experiences that they are looking for in facilitators. Trainers and program developers may consider whether the items they consider to be the most critical aspects of IC are rating accordingly by a majority of facilitators. Continued training, coaching and reassessing facilitator needs may be necessary to ensure that the vital components of the program are represented by the staff carrying out the intervention.

**What is considered unimportant?**

Very few items were rated as not important by a sizeable group of facilitators. Most items had less than 10% of respondents rating them as Not Important. However, a few items were rated by several of the participants as Not Important. These included tasks in which the facilitator was doing a task for the case managers or in place of another team member, such as *assigning difficult cases to the facilitator* (40%); *fulfilling the Systems Manager role* (35); *facilitating the meeting themselves* (33%); *sitting with case managers during meetings with teachers* (29%); and *completing the Instructional Assessment for the case managers* (20%). Ratings on the item, *choose team members based on expertise in data collection, intervention or curriculum* (37%) may be related to facilitators' beliefs that case managers can be trained in data collection, intervention skills and curriculum knowledge, so that these criteria may not be critical for joining the team. Responses may have been different if facilitators were instead asked about the importance of having these skills represented on the team when members were completely trained.

Some items rated as not important may reflect differences in expectations and job requirements in the various settings, such as *plan technical support for district* (54%); *coach others online* (41%); *engage in non-IC tasks* (34%); and *engaged in community building activities* (24%). Other items may reflect different ways in which facilitators may conceptualize the role, such as *having a co-facilitator during meetings* (27%) and *delegating the Systems Manager role* (20%).

One item from the belief section emerged as not important to a large portion of the participants: *ability has more influence on success than effort* (51%). This item was

drawn from the literature on fixed versus growth mindsets (Dweck, 2008). Although a large portion of the participants rated this as important, the variability in responses suggests that the beliefs about ability and effort may require further exploration through research and training.

The unimportant tasks may be important for further study, as they may help to clarify differences in the expected role from the perspective of trainers and program developers and the reality of IC Teams in schools. Developers may decide to eliminate some of these tasks from the expectations of the role or they may see the need for additional training so that facilitators value the tasks to the same degree as outlined in the training manuals.

**Research Question 2: Changeability**

Research Question 2 states: What is the estimated percentage of all facilitators that would likely rate beliefs and characteristics as not at all changeable, somewhat changeable or very changeable by training and experience?

The common theme from the ratings of importance and changeability in the survey of IC facilitators is consensus. Facilitators generally agree about what is important and their ratings are consistent with the literature. Table 14 in Chapter 4 shows the frequencies of essential ratings facilitators assigned to the various items in the Changeability category. Percent of changeable ratings ranged from 13 to 76%. Facilitators rated all but one item as somewhat or very changeable. Trustworthiness was an exception, as 41% of facilitators rated this characteristic as not changeable through training and experience. Trustworthiness was viewed by many as a critical trait, as 92% rated it as an essential characteristic for facilitators. It appears that many facilitators view

trustworthiness as a characteristic that must be selected for, as it is essential but may not be trainable. Trustworthiness may be especially important in IC because of the emphasis on risk-taking, the vulnerability involved with asking for assistance with a classroom concern, and providing feedback and coaching to team members. One item, *believing that IC can work* was rated as both highly essential (86%) and as very changeable (76%). This belief may be of particular value to program developers and trainers, as it was seen as critical and also malleable by practicing facilitators.

Burkhouse (2012) asked consultants and consultation trainers to report on the trainability of a variety of competencies for consultants. The current study revealed similar conclusions regarding changeability through training and experience. Reflection was rated as one of the most trainable skills in Burkhouse's study. This was also true for the participating facilitators', as 69% rated *being a reflective practitioner* as very changeable by training and experience. Trustworthiness was rated as a relatively untrainable skill in Burkhouse's study of consultants and 41% of facilitators in the current study agreed, reporting this characteristic as not changeable. There is considerable overlap in the core competencies for consultants and the essential skills and characteristics of the IC facilitator, even though the role of the facilitator expands beyond case management in a consultee-centered consultation relationship.

**Research Question 3**

Research question 3 states: Do IC Facilitators' ratings of importance and changeability differ significantly by phase of implementation completed by the facilitators or years of experience as a facilitator?

After determining the frequency of ratings for each item and the expected number of facilitators to answer similarly if the entire population was surveyed, group differences were explored. Research question 3 was posed to determine if a relationship existed between training, as measured by the most advanced phase through which the facilitator had led a team, or experience, as measured by years of experience in the role, and ratings of importance/changeability on each survey item. Facilitators were divided into groups based on years of experience (novice and veteran) and also by the most advanced team they had ever led (Phase 2 or Phase 3). As described in Chapter 3, there were not enough facilitators reporting to have led a team only through Phase 1 to be included in the chi square analyses.

The chi square test of independence was used to assess relations between the variables of group membership and ratings. This test assumes that there is no association between categorical variables. The null hypothesis for all items was that the variables were independent of each other and that no relationship between ratings and experience/training would exist. Each survey item was analyzed twice- once by training (phase) and once by experience (novice vs. veteran). For most of the 196 analyses conducted, the null hypothesis was supported. The chi square tests revealed very few significant differences between ratings based on either grouping. This means that, generally speaking, facilitators rate the same tasks, characteristics, abilities, skills, beliefs and types of knowledge as not important, important, or essential. The same conclusion was also true for ratings of changeability by training and experience. Out of 98 items, 17 were found to have a significant difference between novice and veteran facilitators. When divided by phases, only 7 items were found to have significant differences between

groups with regard to rating patterns. The consistency in ratings, despite differences in years of experience and advanced training, suggests that the initial facilitator training produces trainers with common language, values, and manifestations of the role. This is a positive finding in that one can reasonably expect facilitators from different schools to function in similar ways. Consistency among facilitators is a positive step toward consistency in implementation.

Interpretations for group differences on individual items could be generated; however when an adjustment was applied to address the large number of simultaneous tests conducted, none of the results remained significant. No category stood out as having many more significant relationships before the adjustment between the groups and ratings on the items. It is also critical to note that ten of the 17 significant relationships included more than 20% of cells with expected counts less than 5. The small cell counts violate a critical assumption of the chi square test and may indicate that the significance is over estimated.

Frequency data for ratings of importance (research questions 1 and 2) indicated that there was little variability in ratings for several items. In fact, several items were rated as important or essential by 100% of participants. Survey items were designed based on a review of the IC training literature, previous research on IC Teams and IC Teams facilitators, as well as general team leadership research (Burkhouse, 2012; McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012). Participating facilitators' ratings and the estimated ratings of all facilitators suggest that many of the items selected represent important and essential tasks, characteristics, beliefs, skills and knowledge. This is consistent with previous findings in the IC Team

Facilitator literature (McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; Vaganek, 2012), as well as the general literature on team leadership and facilitation (Gravois, Rosenfield, & Gickling, 2002; Gravois, Gickling, & Rosenfield, 2007; Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2010; Nelson et al., 2009; Thomas, 2004).

Given the large number of analyses conducted and the general consensus between groups on most items, statements and conclusions about group differences may be an over-interpretation of the data. The Benjamini-Hochberg Method was applied to address false positives that may result from multiple simultaneous comparisons. The Benjamini-Hochberg Method rendered all of the significant relations between ratings and groups non-significant. This suggests that the significant values were false positives and that none of the null hypotheses should be rejected. This is further evidence that there are no significant group differences in ratings of importance or changeability based on training or experience level according to the ratings from the participating facilitators

**Implications**

The results of this study contribute toward developing a consensus in the literature on facilitation of IC problem-solving teams. There is generally consensus among facilitators about what is important and what beliefs and characteristics can be changed and trained, according to as indicated by the estimated frequencies of ratings for all facilitators and the comparisons between groups based on training and experience, The survey items were drawn from the literature and were intended to represent the characteristics, skills, abilities, beliefs and types of knowledge that were expected to be important to successful IC Teams facilitation (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; McMahon, 1998; Neall & Cassata, 2009; Vaganek, 2012). These are the items that are considered

valuable and this has implications for training and selection. Few differences between groups is a positive finding in this case. It suggests that IC facilitators value similar characteristics, skills, knowledge and beliefs. This adds some consistency to the program despite variability in such factors as years of experience, training level, percent of time allocated to the role, school, district and state-level factors.

Program developers and trainers may be able to use the facilitators' ratings of importance and changeability to improve and enhance the training protocol for facilitators. School districts may consider exploring potential candidates' beliefs when making hiring decisions. Although some of the beliefs and characteristics were rated as changeable, it may help to streamline training and improve retention if candidates are selected based on the criteria that other facilitators regard as important.

Evaluations of the IC Teams facilitator may also be informed by the survey items, as these are considered the critical skills and tasks of the job. Schools and program trainers may be able to use the essential skills to assess facilitator strengths and needs for the purposes of formative and summative evaluations. This may help to tailor feedback to the facilitator to ensure that they receive the necessary support and resources to continue their professional development. Berger et al.'s (2014) analysis suggested that schools with considerable facilitator turnover had less teacher utilization of the team. Attention should be paid to retaining facilitators to improve utilization. Selecting and evaluating the facilitators based on strength that align with the important items from the survey may allow trainers and coaches to tailor training to meet specific needs. Building skills so that facilitators feel competent in all of the important areas may decrease turnover and improve satisfaction in the role.

**Limitations**

This study of the perceived importance and changeability by training and experience of a variety of beliefs, characteristics, skills, tasks, and knowledge of the facilitator supports an emerging consensus about the role.  However, the conclusions drawn must be considered within the context of some limitations.

First, the response rate of the survey impacts both sampling variance and a possible bias in the result due to differences between responders and non-responders. Approximately half of the facilitator population participated in the survey.  The data collected from the participating half of the group was used to estimate how many of all facilitators would rate each item in Research Question 1.  There is no information available on the non-responding portion of the population and it is not clear if there are meaningful differences between responders and non-responders that would lead to significant differences in rating patterns.  Facilitators were not asked to provide data regarding their geographic location or the district in which they work, so conclusions regarding differences in the facilitator role in different districts or states are not drawn.

In hindsight, changes to the survey and means of contacting participants could have provided some information on the non-responders.  The survey could have included a follow-up item for participants who indicated they did not wish to participate. Participants could have been given options such as: I do not have time; I am not interested in this research; I am not a facilitator, or other.  If phone numbers for facilitators had been available in the contact information, a sample of non-responders could have been asked to participate in a short phone survey about their reasons for non-response.  Some data regarding facilitators' school district could have been extracted from

the email addresses of the responders and non-responders as well. If facilitator data had been connected to school and team data, especially on utilization and implementation, differences between responders and non-responders could have been analyzed.

Second, the response options in the survey dictated the type of analyses that were possible. Initially, a five-point scale was proposed; however the investigator and IC experts raised concerns regarding the practical meaning or significance of ratings like 'slightly important'. The three-point scale was selected for this survey with the goal of providing clear response options. A five-point Likert-type scale would have provide more levels and would have allowed the data to be interpreted as intervals, rather than as ordinal categories. Interval data would have lent itself to the use of other statistical analyses, such as regression.

Third, the IC Teams facilitators are a small, finite population. At the time of data collection, there were 169 unique facilitator names available in the database. The response rate to the survey was about half of the active facilitators. In order to estimate the responses of the full population, a correction factor for a finite population was applied before the confidence interval was calculated. The small sample size also led to a violation of critical assumption of Chi Square test of Independence for some items, as the expected cell counts were often less than 5. This violation leads to overestimation of the significance of the relationship between variables.

When analyzing the relationship between training and ratings, only Phases 2 and 3 were included. The Phase 1 group could not be analyzed due to the small number of facilitators in the group (n= 6). There may be differences in ratings based on facilitators completing only Phase 1 of the training; however, those relationships could not be

explored. The chi square tests of independence also assume that novice/veterans and phase 2 and phase 3 facilitators are equally distributed in population and equally likely to respond to the survey; however, this may not be the case.

Fourth, the participants were included because they have a very specific job-the IC Teams facilitator.  Although many of the characteristics, skills, abilities and tasks associated with IC Teams facilitation likely overlap with other types of teams and interventions, it is likely that many items would not generalize to other groups of team leaders and facilitators, given their specific relationship to the IC Team model.

Finally, facilitators voluntarily provided self-reported data.  There may be some influences of social desirability as they were asked to rate many statements drawn directly from the IC training materials and literature.  It is possible that facilitators felt some obligation to rate certain statements as important. Facilitators may also have had different understanding of the response options, especially when deciding between important and essential.

**Future Directions**

The study of the perceived importance and changeability of IC facilitator characteristics, skills, beliefs, knowledge and tasks contributes to closing gaps in the literature on problem-solving team facilitation.  Schools, among other organizations, used teams to address needs, generate solutions and implement interventions (Iverson, 2002; Kovaleski, 2002; Rosenfield & Humphrey, 2012).  However, there continues to be a lack of empirical understanding of the traits and characteristics that are important to facilitation and lead to successful team leadership and implementation of team models. Facilitators are critical to program outcomes because of the role they play in program

implementation.  Selection and training should put the right people in place to lead the program to ensure implementation fidelity and increase the likelihood of results on key outcome measures.  The current research has focused on the characteristics, beliefs, skills and abilities of the facilitator, with some attention paid to the possibility of changing some of the important beliefs and characteristics.

Additional investigations to inform selection and training should include self-report ratings of skill level and the degree to which facilitators display the traits deemed important in the literature. It is possible that facilitators' ratings of importance are influenced by the tasks and traits in which they feel proficient. Comparing the beliefs of prospective facilitators and outcomes such as turnover and utilization may help to enhance selection.

The next steps in the line of research would extend the understanding of facilitators' influence on implantation and the fidelity of implementation. Future studies should include a measure of implementation so that ratings of importance or skills level could be linked to utilization and success of the intervention.  Comparing ratings of importance with outcome measures would strengthen the construct validity of the survey, in that it may be possible to demonstrate that the items that facilitators say are important actually lead to differences in outcomes.

Future studies should include data from multiple sources, as the current survey provided insight only into facilitators' perception of the role. Observational studies of facilitators would provide additional insight into the day-to-day tasks required to complete the job.  Ratings of important skills, characteristics, tasks, and knowledge could be completed by team members and compared to facilitator ratings. Additional surveys

and interviews of the IC facilitator could address facilitators' perception of the most important tasks and characteristics by asking them to rank order the survey items as another means of determining the most critical items related to the role.

Level of Implementation data, which is already collected by facilitators, would provide a rich data source to better understand the context of the school and team in which the facilitator functions.  Ultimately, IC Teams aims to improve student academic and behavioral functioning by way of improving teacher skills.  Student achievement data and teacher evaluation data would complete the picture in terms of understanding how facilitators impact the implementation and effectiveness of the program.

Turnover is an important variable to explore, given the important role of training and coaching that is expected of the facilitator.  Future studies may explore how beliefs, skills, tasks and characteristics impact facilitator retention and turnover.

Additional information on facilitators' ability to address conflict between IC and other teams and cope with changes and adversity may be enlightening to the field, as it appears that IC facilitators may also be closely involved with other school-related teams and tasks, such special education eligibility, data-review teams, school improvement teams, and others. Many of the values and beliefs that are essential to the IC facilitator role may overlap with the critical components of other teams. However some important factors may conflict, especially between the consultee-centered consultation model and other teams/programs that focus on deficits inherent to the child or rely on experts to provide interventions.  Future research may also investigate how facilitator cope with different demands placed on them when they must change roles within the same school. For example, a survey or interview study might capture the ways in which facilitators

manage different duties as they related to pre-referral problem solving teams, special education eligibility teams and providing direct services to students outside of the facilitator role.

Future research could address how to train and build the traits that are considered important. There may be differences in trainability depending on training modality, such as workshops, online coaching with more experienced facilitators, or other means. Facilitators in the current study were asked in a sense, to reflect back on the characteristics and beliefs that may be changeable through training and experience that they already had. The current study did not take into account facilitators' beliefs before training.

Longitudinal research on the IC Facilitator could be useful in addressing the suspected evolution of the role. Some of the findings from this study suggest that the role has changed, at least in some districts, from the role as it was described in Rosenfield and Gravois (1996) book on IC Teams. A study that follows facilitators throughout their training may be able to assess the subtle changes in beliefs, competence, and experience as the facilitator works through training, withstands changes in the school climate, and leads different teams.

**Reflections for Study Redesign**

Upon the completion of this study, some important changes in the survey design, research methodology and data analysis are considered. Additional analysis of the survey instrument itself, using a method like latent variable analysis, could have been used to determine if there were concepts in the items that hung together. Deeper analysis of the survey may have helped to reduce the number of items and streamline the instrument. A

shorter, more concise tool may have led to higher response rates. The survey could have been distributed online and via mail at the same time of LOI data collection. Combining the voluntary survey data collection with an activity that was already scheduled may have resulted in higher response rates.

The comparison of facilitators based on years of experience in the role and level of training was a concept that was added when the study was proposed to the committee. The basics of the survey were already in place. In hindsight, had the survey been designed with more of a focus on the difference phases of implementation, group differences may have emerged. The survey was based on the important aspects of IC facilitators at all levels.

**Conclusions**

IC Facilitator is a key factor in the successful implementation of IC Teams, a consultee-centered consultation model designed to help teachers assist each other in solving academic and behavior concerns in the classroom (Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996). Teams play a critical role in intervention implementation and decision-making in schools and are therefore worthy of continued study (Rosenfield, 2008). The current study expanded the understanding of the role of the IC facilitator, who is tasked with leading the change process, implementing IC teams, and training team members. There is considerable consensus in the IC Teams and general facilitation literature on the essential skills, beliefs, knowledge, tasks and characteristics required for successfully carrying out the IC facilitator role. Facilitators rated most items as important or essential, but the items rated essential by 75% of the respondents paint the most interesting picture for the purposes of enhancing training and building capacity of the intervention in schools. Tests

to address group differences based on training and experience revealed a generally homogonous group, as no significant results persisted after addressing violated assumptions of the tests and the large number of analyses conducted. It appears that facilitators, regardless of their status as a novice or veteran, or whether they have led a team through phase 2 or phase 3, rate items similarly regarding importance and changeability.

Although many of the essential items from the IC literature and training manuals were also corroborated by current facilitators, some gaps emerged. Fewer participants found it essential to engage in and analyze implementation data than expected based on the emphasis on program evaluation in the literature (Gravois et al., 2007). This may point to a continued need to revise the training sequence to capture the realities of working in schools as well as imparting the importance of these activities to facilitators. Continued research that includes ratings from addition staff, measures of competence in the essential items, and comparison to outcome measures would add valuable additional information to a field that has considerable impact on student and teacher achievement.

## Appendix A: Skills Necessary for Change Facilitation

(Rosenfield & Gravois, 1996; McMahon, 1998; Adapted from Miles, Saxl, &

Lieberman, 1988)

| Skill | Definition |
|-------|------------|
| Interpersonal ease | Ability to relate easily with others |
| Group functioning | Understanding group dynamic, ability to facilitate teamwork |
| Training/doing workshops | Instructing others systematically |
| General education | Broad education experience |
| Educational content | Knowledge of schools and subject areas |
| Administrative/ organizational | Defining and structuring team activities/time |
| Initiative-taking | Starting activities, pushing self & others toward action |
| Trust/rapport building | Creating a sense of openness amongst team |
| Support | Providing encouragement to others |
| Confrontation | Direct expression of negative information |
| Conflict mediation | Resolving/improving different interests |
| Collaboration | Creating an environment of sharing |
| Confidence-building | Strengthening others' sense of efficacy |
| Identifying needs of others | Forming a valid picture of needs/problems of individuals |
| Identifying needs of organizations | Forming a valid picture of needs/problems of the school as an institution |
| Managing/controlling | Coordinating events, time, people, and influencing |

| | others |
|---|---|
| Resource-bringing | Locating and providing needed materials, information, etc. |
| Demonstration | Modeling skills, behaviors in meeting, etc. |

**Appendix B: Task Statements from IC Facilitator Interviews (Vaganek, 2012)**

| Change Process |
|---|
| Understand the Change Process |
| Facilitate Change for IC |
| *e.g., Advocate, represent, and support IC (i.e. be a cheerleader; address concerns about time it takes to take a case)* |
| **Beliefs** |
| Assume children can learn, but not in the same way<br><br>or at the same rate |
| Belief in Collaboration |
| *e.g., Teachers can work together; no one is an expert; don't let own beliefs interfere when working with others* |
| Believe in IC as a good process |
| *e.g., Believe it can work, believe in the mission; have a vision of how it can work; commitment to following the process with integrity* |
| **Knowledge** |
| Know principals of learning and behavior for children and adults |
| Know best practices in instruction |
| *e.g., Intervention strategies, etc.* |
| Know content/curriculum |
| Knowledge of IC process/philosophy |
| *e.g., Problem solving process, training in IC, how to do IA* |
| Know the change process |
| *e.g., How IC can work in your school, vision, direction ; know team dynamics* |
| **Skills** |
| Use communication skills |
| *e.g., Paraphrase, summarize, ask clarifying questions, etc.* |
| Use Management skills |

| |
|---|
| *e.g., Time management, organizational skills, keep people on task, prioritize time* |
| Case management skills |
| *e.g., Narrow down concerns, do assessments, interpret data,* |
| Use interpersonal skills |
| *e.g., Build relationships with staff* |
| Computer skills |
| *e.g., Use ICAT tools, troubleshooting, general computer skills* |
| **Abilities & Attributes** |
| Executive functioning skills |
| *e.g., Need to be able to break things down into smaller pieces; organize; be a self-starter; multi-task; be flexible, be able to see the bigger picture* |
| Interpersonal skills |
| *e.g., Work with groups; work with people/different personalities; deal with different personalities; empathize with others; empower others that they can do it (the process); help people feel certain; help others to feel safe; be able to read other people; deal with hard questions and attitudes of adults; help others reflect on how they feel* |
| Personal attributes |
| *e.g., Be patient; take risks; be firm but understanding and supportive* |
| **Case Management** |
| Engage in Case Management |
| *e.g., Engage in case management with teachers, principal or others as consultee* |
| Problem Solving Process |
| *e.g., Collect data; meet with consultee; engage in small group cases; provide feedback to teachers;  sit with teacher during snapshot; help to implement strategy; bring in strategy resources/info* |
| Interpersonal tasks in Case Management |
| *e.g., Help lower consultee's anxiety; keep conversations congruent; connect with teacher; understand where teacher is with their concern; develop rapport with teachers (consultees)* |
| Communication with Consultee |

| |
|---|
| *e.g., check in with consultee informally via phone, email, in person* |
| **Team Business** |
| Oversee all tasks related to IC |
| Set up/ build team |
| *e.g., Choose team members that you know will be supportive; bring on new team members when others leave; meet with people before they join the team* |
| Build confidence of team members |
| Assess team and team members |
| *e.g., Ask team what their needs are; administer self-assessment to team; engage in temperature-taking; conduct need assessment; talk with team about how they feel to inform planning; get feedback from team about what they want to work on; ask team to complete reflection sheet* |
| Encourage teachers to utilize the IC team |
| *e.g., Encourage teachers who have had a bad experience with IC to take another case; get as many teachers as I can involved with IC; get as many teachers as I can to have a positive experience with IC* |
| Set goals and expectations for team (i.e. with input from team, based on needs assess, etc) |
| Cover class so teacher/case manager can meet |
| Oversee team members' cases |
| *e.g., Send reminders to case managers to make sure they don't skip steps of the process; be aware of the all the cases that the team has; touch base with case managers to see if they need anything for the week; collect data on how case managers are progressing; remind members that they are still doing cases; track cases; constantly work/nurture the steps of the case for case manager; encourage team members; make sure cases are moving forward (remind case managers of the timeline goals)* |
| Attend and Facilitate IC Meetings |
| *e.g., Make sure everyone stays on track; address goals of the meeting; introduce topics/activities; set next agenda; process/reflect with team member after meeting* |
| Fulfill systems manager role |
| *e.g., Use ICAT tools to update cases; ask team members to fill out check sheet of info for case updates to collect during meeting; take down case update info on paper* |
| Maintain meeting climate |

| |
|---|
| *e.g., Keep things fresh; keep energy up; create an open forum; encourage others to provide input; give members opportunities for leadership roles in meeting* |
| Provide training during meeting |
| *e.g., Conduct case reviews; provide practice opportunities; review stages of process* |
| Distribute new cases |
| *e.g., Determine which cases are tougher and take those myself; ask for volunteers for cases, hand out new cases* |
| **Organizational/Clerical Tasks** |
| Create materials for cases |
| *e.g., Create intervention materials such as flashcards, games, etc.; develop information materials for teachers; create scoring rubrics; gather intervention materials; find and organize assessment materials for my cases;* |
| Create materials for team training |
| *e.g., Create/edit videos of my cases for training; make up fake cases for training; create power points; make handouts of math assessments; make binders of resources for team members; create review games, write scripts; create visuals for training; make info sheets; write checklists for stages; write list of operational definitions; make copies for the meeting(case review documents, SDF's, etc); make sure forms are available; look for materials for assessment/intervention in the resources that have been collected by team; check goals in order to plan meetings; ask team to assemble binder of resources for their use* |
| Preparing for team meetings and trainings |
| *e.g., Write meeting plan; make notes for meeting; prepare for meeting; create meeting schedule, organize materials for meeting; differentiate training; plan for half- and full-day trainings; write agendas for meetings; invite students/teachers for training meetings; copy materials; order lunch for team (for meetings); call substitutes to cover for team members during meetings/trainings; divvy up training tasks among team member; in the summer, plan the agenda for meetings/trainings for the year; prepare for meetings with consultees* |
| Communication (with team, consultees, staff, etc.) |
| *e.g., Send out online surveys to get information from staff about professional development needs or meeting times; communicate with team members about their schedule for the week;* |
| Prepare for Coaching |
| *e.g., Prepare for coaching meetings; print out tracking forms and check dates with team members* |
| Complete paperwork and administrative tasks |

| |
|---|
| *e.g., Log hours; update paperwork after meeting with a teacher; maintain files on cases; maintain notebook for record keeping at meetings; keep a folder for each case I am working on; keep records on cases; read emails; travel between buildings; manage clerical/admin. tasks; make sure IC data is available for 'screening meeting' (special education process if child is referred; cover classes for teachers to encourage them to be a consultee* |
| Providing information to staff |
| *e.g., Write blub for monthly parent newsletter; maintain IC bulletin board; prepare presentations for staff; create graphs for staff newsletter; maintain whiteboard with goal attainment info and steps of the process* |
| Manage schedules |
| *e.g., Keep schedule of appointments; determine which teachers need to hear from me today; manage team's schedule; review appts for the day; coordinate schedules for subs; coordinate meeting times for members I am coaching; make time in schedule to meet with teachers for my cases; keep lists meetings I need to get ready for; adjust meeting schedules if something comes up; set up screening meeting (special education process)if child is not making progress in IC case* |
| IC Program Development Tasks (district level) |
| *e.g., Prepare for district meetings; email to set up tech support dates; set county-wide meeting agenda* |
| **Admin. Contact** |
| Communicate with administrator |
| *e.g., Provide principal with my goals, give updates about IC, discuss sustainability/expectations* |
| Present to principals/school board |
| **Training** |
| Provide professional development to staff/faculty |
| *e.g., Attend monthly staff meeting; give updates to staff re: IC; clarify what IC is to others, create monthly newsletter for faculty, plan and provide professional development via presentations to staff; communicate with staff about IC; let people know what we do; get input from team, principal, etc for presentations; talk to staff and help them to see problems in a different way* |
| Coach/support members through cases |
| *e.g., Coach team members through practice cases, get members to start cases; encourage team members to have be observe their meetings with consultees; provide non-evaluative feedback; help others reflect; review with case managers before they meet with teachers; help case managers grow in their skills; process with case managers after they have met with teachers;* |
| Train new team members |

| |
|---|
| *e.g., Partner up experienced and new team members; meet weekly with new case managers, provide half- and full-day training to new team members, do training sessions to get new members up to speed with experienced members; plan training around rotating team membership; ask veteran members to observe and mentor new members* |
| Provide on-going team-member training (content) |
| *e.g., Review and practice skills, teach Instructional assessment with students; teach communication skills; instruct team members to use forms/resources; provide training for reading cases; teach steps of the process; teach principals of learning; teach team how to do whole-class word search; teach from ICAT books* |
| Provide on-going team-member training in weekly meetings, and half/full day trainings (process) |
| *e.g., Help others to reflect (i.e. on skills, process, meetings, etc); ask veteran members to mentor and observe new members; as team members to partner up to practice skills and share ideas; process sessions with consultants after they meet with teachers; complete/review SDF's as training activity; answer questions during case reviews; use modeling, role-plays, guided practice and direct instruction to teach skills; engage in individual training; ask members to share cases; ask for input/concerns/issues to inform training; review student work samples; provide feedback to team members; come up with new ways to review old skills; have team members provide training; share audio recordings of my meetings with teachers; team members observe me as case manager; meet with case managers when they start a new type of case* |
| **Facilitator Training** |
| Attend and participate in facilitator trainings and meetings |
| *e.g., Attend networking meetings; attend state level meetings, county-wide meetings, district meetings, etc; attend session training; follow up with trainers with questions* |
| Engage in Peer Networking |
| *e.g., Act as a mentor for other facilitators in the county; help other facilitators with questions; provide feedback to others facilitators about their skills; share knowledge and info with other facilitators; practice skills with other facilitators; support other facilitators; collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions; receive online coaching; practice assessment skills with other facilitators; receive feedback about my facilitation from others; talk to other facilitators about how they conduct training and discuss what works;* |
| Engage in other professional development activities to build own skills as a facilitator. |
| *e.g., Participate in training for making charts and graphs on computer; participate in Professional Learning Community and attend meetings about math facts, working memory, repetition with grade level tea; further my training as a facilitator; engage in book study (IC book; communicate with my buddy; receive tech support; participate in professional development for myself in case management and problem solving; attend teacher trainings so I have a knowledge of curriculum; receive small-group tech training as follow-up to session training; look for resources/info online (e.g., ICAT, university websites, searches for info on learning, behavior, etc); reflect* |

| **Performance Standards** |
|---|
| Complete LOI (IC Program Evaluation) |
| *e.g., Interview IC Team at other schools, participate in interviews; coordinate interviews* |
| Review LOI data to inform team goals, planning, etc |
| Use ICAT tools for data entry and feedback |
| *e.g., Enter whole kindergarten class into ICAT tools; enter case data* |
| Engage in evaluation of my performance |
| *e.g., Complete school's evaluation tool; receive summative evaluation at end of year from administration; participate in state evaluation system; meet with principal and instructional specialist about my work; get observed by principal; complete end of year reports; receive thanks for work as facilitator (an informal measure of progress; meet with district coordinator to discuss my performance; set goal based on IC implementation data; rate myself on performance objective for tech support; keep data on my professional goal* |
| **Conflict** |
| Manage conflict between programs |
| *e.g., Role of RTI and IC in the same school* |
| Manage conflict between Case Managers and Consultees |
| *e.g., Mediate when teacher does not feel that student progress is enough* |
| Manage conflict between team members |
| *e.g., Deal with pretty things such as disagreements such as meeting times.* |
| Receive negative feedback re: IC |
| *e.g., Hear/deflect complaints; do not interpret negative reactions personally* |
| **Additional School Responsibilities and "Extra Hand" Activities** |
| Attend to other school tasks and other school responsibilities |
| Definition: Staff member has additional duties that are expected to be fulfilled on a regular basis as a part of their role as a school employee.  These are not 'emergency' situations. |
| *e.g., Participate on other teams, conduct standardized testing, complete assigned duties (lunch, etc); present to staff on non-IC topics; attend and participate in special events* |
| Act as an extra hand |

| |
|---|
| Definition: When the IC Facilitator assists in an 'emergency' situation in which a staff person is needed, regardless of their other role or specific skill set. |
| **IC Program Development** |
| Coach others online |
| Develop support network in district |
| Act as a trainer for others in IC |
| *e.g., Work with coordinator to help conduct Session training; provide tech support; plan county-wide meetings; attend session training; coordinate county-wide facilitators; help conduct new member training with coordinator; train new team members from other teams in count as a part of county-wide new member training; plan tech support for the district; attend training at ICAT Center with coordinator; shadow coordinate at new member trainings; work toward becoming a trainer of the process; lead sessions for case managers at district meetings; act as a mentor for other facilitators in the county* |

**Appendix C: Revised Survey Items**

The survey was amended based on feedback from two experts in IC Facilitator training. Additions and revised items are highlighted according to the key below. Additions are new items or items with substantial changes in wording that affect meaning. Revised items have been edited to correct errors, have minor changes in wording, or have been clarified. Deleted items are listed at the end of the survey.

**Key:**
Additions
Revisions/Modification
Deletions

**Facilitator Survey**

**Importance**

**Directions:** Think about the **critical** aspects of implementing and facilitating IC Teams.

Are some statements more important than others? Using a scale of 1 to 5, how important

are the following knowledge, skills, abilities, tasks, beliefs and characteristics for role of

the IC Facilitator?

*1= Not Important*
*2=Important*
*3=Essential*

Knowledge
1. Know principles of learning and behavior for adults
2. Know principles of learning and behavior for children
3. Know best practices in instruction
4. Know content/curriculum (e.g. academic standards; reading, writing, math content, etc).
5. Know IC process/philosophy
6. Know change process
7. Know about team dynamics and team functioning

Beliefs
8. Believe IC can work
9. Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability
10. Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort
11. Believe that all school staff have valuable expertise

12. Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers

Characteristics & Abilities

13. Have a capacity for relationship-building
14. Be trustworthy
15. Be able to take another person's perspective
16. Be a reflective practitioner
17. Have strong communication skills
18. Manage and prioritize your time
19. Keep others (adults) on tasks
20. Have strong organizational skills of physical space and materials
21. Be able to multi-task in your role as facilitator
22. Be flexible, as an attitude
23. Be able to see the bigger picture
24. Be able to break down tasks into smaller parts
25. Receive negative feedback about IC
26. Help others to reflect on their practices
27. Be able to read other people (e.g. read social cues; social insight) as a team facilitator
28. Be a self-starter
29. Help team members to feel safe and certain
30. Be willing to take professional risks
31. Respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults
32. Manage conflict between IC Teams and other programs
33. Manage conflict between team members
34. Be able to work with people with different personalities
35. Help staff create and work towards a common goal
36. Align program goals of IC with other school initiatives and vision

Skills

37. Manage and analyze data on the computer
38. To have completed IC training in case management
39. Have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills
40. Have strong group facilitation/group process skills
41. Have strong classroom management skills (e.g. as a classroom teacher)

Case Management

42. Model effective case management
43. Engage in the problem solving process (as a case manager)
44. Complete Instructional Assessments for trained case managers

45. Sit with case managers during meetings with consultees

Team-Related Tasks

46. Choose or have influence over the choice of team members that will be supportive of IC
47. Choose team members with expertise in data collection, interventions, or curriculum
48. Choose team members who are open to learning new skills
49. Assess team members' skills and needs
50. Set goals and expectations for the team
51. Delegate meeting roles and responsibilities
52. Facilitate the team meeting yourself
53. Have a co-facilitator during meetings
54. Cover classes so teacher/case manager can met
55. Provide coaching on team members' cases
56. Facilitate IC Team Meetings
57. Provide non-evaluative feedback to team members
58. Train new team members
59. Plan tech support for the school district
60. Provide on-going training to team members
61. Provide on-going support to team members after they have been trained to take cases
62. Fulfill Systems Manager Role
63. Delegate the Systems Manager Role
64. Maintain IC Teams meeting climate
65. Manage the team's schedule
66. Distribute new cases
67. Assign difficult cases or consultees to yourself
68. Create material for case management
69. Create material for training
70. Complete paperwork and administrative tasks
71. Encourage teachers to use IC
72. Present to staff at the beginning of the year about Instructional Consultation Teams
73. Provide regular, on-going training on IC to school staff
74. Advocate for the team in school
75. Engage in community-building activities (e.g. participate in field day, etc)
76. Engage in non-IC school-related tasks (e.g. proctor standardized tests; bus/hall/cafeteria duty; etc.)

Admin Contact
77. Engage in district-level program development tasks
78. Communicate with administrator regularly
79. Discuss the sustainability and expectations of IC with administrator
80. Present information about IC to administrators or school board
81. Receive summative  evaluation from administrator(s)

Training for Self
82. Attend and participate in facilitator training and meetings
83. Attend networking/district-level facilitator meetings
84. Collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions
85. Engage in other professional development activities on my own to build my skills as a facilitator

Measure Implementation
86. Complete Level of Implementation (LOI) end-of-year evaluation tasks.
87. Review Level of Implementation (LOI) data to inform team goals, planning, etc
88. Use ICAT Tools for data entry and feedback
89. Coach others online
90. Develop a support network for facilitators within your district

**Changeability**

Directions:  You have just rated the importance of a variety of beliefs and characteristics that may be related to the role of IC Facilitator.   Do you think beliefs and characteristics are something good facilitators can develop with time, training, and experience? Or are these traits static? Are they facets of an employee that need to be in place when he or she is hired?

Think about the following questions as you read the items: Given the way training is structured for Instructional Consultation Teams Facilitators, are the following beliefs and characteristics changeable? Can they be developed with training and experience? Think of your own beliefs and your training and experiences with IC Teams facilitation.  On a scale of on a scale of 1 to 3, how changeable through training and experience are the following personal characteristics?

1 = *not at all changeable by training and experience*
2 = *somewhat changeable by training and experience*
3 = *very changeable by training and experience*

(Note that you have already rated the importance of the following statements. In this section please focus on how *changeable* you think these beliefs and characteristics are)

1. Have a capacity for relationship-building
2. Be trustworthy
3. Be able to take another person's perspective
4. Be a reflective practitioner
5. Believe IC can work
6. Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability
7. Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort
8. Believe that all staff have valuable expertise
9. Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers
10. Believe that team members' beliefs can be changed

## Demographics/Contextual Factors

1. What is your gender? *Male, Female, Prefer not to answer*
2. How many teams do you facilitate? *1, 2, 3 or more*
3. Do you facilitate or lead other non-IC teams in your school(s)?
4. How many years have you been a facilitator?
5. What phase of implementation are your teams in? Phase 1 (initiate/readiness), Phase 2 (implementation/have a working team) or Phase 3(sustain)
6. What is the most advanced team you have led? Phase 1 (initiate/readiness), Phase 2 (implementation/have a working team) or Phase 3(sustain)
7. What was your role before you became a facilitator?
8. Did you work in the same school as a facilitator and in your previous role?
9. How many years were you in that role?
10. If you have another paid role in your school, what is your job title?
11. Are you a full-time or part-time facilitator?
12. What percentage of your time is allocated for your role as an IC Facilitator?
13. What is the general area of your degree? Education, counseling or other related services, other?
14. Are your schools in urban, suburban, or rural areas?
15. What grades are served in each school? *Elementary, Middle, High, K-8, K-12, Other*
16. Have you completed the Approved Trainer level of training and development?
17. Have you completed a case under the supervision of a coach?
18. Have you coached others (outside of your team members)?
19. Did you participate in an interview study in 2011 or 2012 about the knowledge, skills and abilities of the IC Facilitator?

### Deletions
- 5-point scale for Importance ratings (changed to 3 point scale)

- Have case management skills
- Oversee case managers' cases

**Appendix D:  Expert Interview Questions for Survey Development**

1. Do you have suggestions regarding the visual presentation or order of the survey items?
2. Were there typos or grammatical/spelling errors in the survey directions or questions?
3. Did you understand the directions?
4. Did you understand the 5-point Likert scale and labels?
5. Did you find jargon or specific terms within the items that should be revised?
6. Which survey items are unclear or confusing?
7. Are there items you would delete? If so, why?
8. What items should be added?
9. Which items were difficult to answer?
10. How can this survey be improved?

## Appendix E: Survey Items

**Importance**

**Directions:** Think about the critical aspects of implementing IC Teams. How important are the following knowledge, skills, abilities, tasks, beliefs and characteristics for role of the IC Facilitator?

Not Important

Important

Essential

<u>Knowledge</u>
1. Know principals of learning and behavior for adults
2. Know principals of learning and behavior for children
3. Know best practices in instruction
4. Know content/curriculum
5. Know IC process/philosophy
6. Know change process
7. Know about team dynamics and team functioning

8. <u>Beliefs</u>
9. Believe IC can work
10. Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability
11. Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort
12. Believe that all staff have valuable expertise
13. Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers

14. <u>Characteristics & Abilities</u>
15. Have a capacity for relationship-building
16. Be trustworthy
17. Be able to take another person's perspective
18. Be a reflective practitioner
19. Have strong communication skills
20. Mange and prioritize your time
21. Keep others on task
22. Have strong organizational skills of physical space and materials
23. Be able to multi-task
24. Be flexible, as an attitude
25. Be able to see the bigger picture

26. Be able to break down tasks into smaller parts
27. Receive negative feedback about IC
28.  Help others to reflect
29. Be able to read other people
30. Be a self-starter
31. Help team members to feel safe and certain
32. Be willing to take professional risks
33. Respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults
34. Manage conflict between IC Teams and other programs
35. Manage conflict between team members
36. Be able to work with people with different personalities

37. Skills
38. Have computer skills
39. Have case management skills
40. Have group facilitation skills

41. Case Management
42. Engage in case management
43. to model effective case management
44. Engage in the problem solving process (as a case manager)
45. Communicate with consultees in a variety of mediums

46. Team-Related Tasks
47. Choose team members that will be supportive of IC
48. Choose team members with expertise in data collection, interventions, or
          curriculum
49. Choose team members who are open to learning new skills
50. Assess team members' skills and needs
51. Set goals and expectations for the team
52. Cover classes so teacher/case manager can met
53. Oversee team members' cases
54. Facilitate IC Team Meetings
55. Provide non-evaluative feedback to team members
56. Train new team members
57. Provide on-going training to team members
58. Fulfill Systems Manager Role
59. Maintain meeting climate
60. Manage the team's schedule
61. Distribute new cases

62. Create material for case management
63. Create material for training
64. Complete paperwork and administrative tasks
65. Encourage teachers to use IC
66. Provide training on IC to school staff
67. Advocate for the team  in school

68. <u>Admin Contact</u>
69. Engage in district level program development tasks
70. Communicate with administrator
71. Discuss the sustainability and expectations of IC with administrator
72. Present information about IC to administrators or school board

73. <u>Training for Self</u>
74. Attend and participate in facilitator training and meetings
75. Attend networking meetings
76. Collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions
77. Engage in other professional development activities to build my skills as a facilitator

78. <u>Measure Implementation</u>
79. Complete LOI
80. Review LOI to inform team goals, planning, etc
81. Use ICAT Tools for data entry and feedback
82. Coach others online
83. Develop a support network within your district

**Changeability**
Directions:  Think of your own beliefs and your training and experiences with IC Teams facilitation.  On a scale of on a scale of 1 to 3, how changeable through training and experience are the following personal characteristics?

1 = *not at all changeable*
2 = *somewhat changeable*
3 = *very changeable*

11. Have a capacity for relationship-building
12. Be trustworthy
13. Be able to take another person's perspective
14. Be a reflective practitioner
15. Believe IC can work

16. Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability
17. Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort
18. Believe that all staff have valuable expertise
19. Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers
20. Believe that team members' beliefs can be changed

## Demographics/Contextual Factors

1. What is your gender? *Male, Female, Prefer not to answer*
2. How many teams do you facilitate?      *1, 2, 3 or more*
3. How many years have you been a facilitator?
4. What phase of implementation are your teams in? Phase 1 phase 2 phase 3
5. What is the most advanced team you have led? Phase 1, Phase 2 or Phase 3
6. What was your role before you became a facilitator?
7. How many years were you in that role?
8. If you have another paid role in your school, what is your job title?
9. Are you a full time or part time facilitator?
10. Are your schools in urban, suburban, or rural areas?
11. What grades are served in each school? *Elementary, Middle, High, K-8, K-12, Other*
12. Did you participate in an interview study in 2011-2012 about the knowledge, skills and abilities of the IC Facilitator?

**Appendix F: IRB Documents**

UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

DATE:                     July 7, 2014

TO:                       Megan Vaganek, MA
FROM:                     University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) IRB

PROJECT TITLE:            [528147-2] A Survey of the Instructional Consultation Teams Facilitator
REFERENCE #:
SUBMISSION TYPE:          Amendment/Modification

ACTION:                   APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:            July 7, 2014
EXPIRATION DATE:          June 22, 2015
REVIEW TYPE:              Expedited Review

REVIEW CATEGORY:          Expedited review category # 7

Thank you for your submission of Amendment/Modification materials for this project. The University of
Maryland College Park (UMCP) IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an
appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research
must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This submission has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the project and
insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must
continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal
regulations require each participant receive a copy of the signed consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this committee prior
to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure which are found on the IRBNet
Forms and Templates Page.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others (UPIRSOs) and SERIOUS and
UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please use the appropriate
reporting forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this
office.

This project has been determined to be a Minimal Risk project. Based on the risks, this project requires
continuing review by this committee on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate forms for this
procedure. Your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and
continued approval before the expiration date of June 22, 2015.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion
of the project.

Generated on IRBNet

UNIVERSITY OF
**MARYLAND**

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

DATE:                    July 7, 2014

TO:                      Megan Vaganek, MA
FROM:                    University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) IRB

PROJECT TITLE:           [528147-2] A Survey of the Instructional Consultation Teams Facilitator
REFERENCE #:
SUBMISSION TYPE:         Amendment/Modification

ACTION:                  APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:           July 7, 2014
EXPIRATION DATE:         June 22, 2015
REVIEW TYPE:             Expedited Review

REVIEW CATEGORY:         Expedited review category # 7

Thank you for your submission of Amendment/Modification materials for this project. The University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

This submission has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulation.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the project and insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require each participant receive a copy of the signed consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure which are found on the IRBNet Forms and Templates Page.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others (UPIRSOs) and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please use the appropriate reporting forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this office.

This project has been determined to be a Minimal Risk project. Based on the risks, this project requires continuing review by this committee on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate forms for this procedure. Your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date of June 22, 2015.

Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years after the completion of the project.

Generated on IRBNet

# UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

DATE: June 1, 2015

TO: Megan Vaganek, MA
FROM: University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) IRB

PROJECT TITLE: [528147-3] A Survey of the Instructional Consultation Teams Facilitator
REFERENCE #:
SUBMISSION TYPE: Continuing Review/Progress Report

ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: June 1, 2015
EXPIRATION DATE: June 22, 2016
REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review

REVIEW CATEGORY: Expedited review category # 8 (a) (c)

Thank you for your submission of Continuing Review/Progress Report materials for this project. The University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) IRB has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

Prior to submission to the IRB Office, this project received scientific review from the departmental IRB Liaison.

This submission has received Expedited Review based on the applicable federal regulations.

This project has been determined to be a Minimal Risk project. Based on the risks, this project requires continuing review by this committee on an annual basis. Please use the appropriate forms for this procedure. Your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date of June 22, 2016.

Please remember that informed consent is a process beginning with a description of the project and insurance of participant understanding followed by a signed consent form. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Unless a consent waiver or alteration has been approved, Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others (UPIRSOs) and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. Please use the appropriate reporting forms for this procedure. All FDA and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed.

All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must be reported promptly to this office.

Generated on IRBNet

**Appendix G: Invitation Emails**

**Introductory Email**

Dear (Insert Facilitator Name):

My name is Megan Vaganek and I am a doctoral school psychology student at the University of Maryland. My advisor is Dr. Sylvia Rosenfield. I am conducting an online survey to better understand the characteristics and beliefs of the IC Facilitator.

As team leaders, consultants, and trainers, IC Facilitators are key players in the successful implementation of IC Teams. My interest in the IC Facilitator has been influenced by a long line of research conducted by program developers, researchers, and facilitators themselves. To date, we have learned about the important tasks, skills and abilities that make up the job IC Facilitators have polled each other regarding their job satisfaction and professional development opportunities, and the importance of various facilitator skills have been surveyed. (References available upon request).However, there is still much to learn about the characteristics and beliefs of the IC Facilitator.

**Would you please consider sharing you valuable insight into the characteristics and beliefs of the IC Facilitator via a brief online survey?**

As a member of a finite group of professionals with a unique skill set, your personal response will be vital. My goal is to gather input from everyone in order to capture the experiences of facilitators across phases of implementation, geographic area, and grade-levels severed.

This study was approved for data collection by the institutional review board at The University of Maryland. Your responses will be kept confidential and any identifying information (e.g. names, email addresses) will be deleted before data analysis.

The survey is expected to take approximately 10 to 15 minutes and participation is voluntary. If you agree, you  will receive an email with the link to the online survey. As a thank you, eight participants who complete the survey and enter their email address will be randomly selected to receive a $25 Amazon gift certificate.

**If you agree you participate, please respond to this email with "Yes" in the body of your email.**

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns at Megan.Vaganek@gmail.com.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you,

Megan Vaganek

**Appendix H:  Survey Email**

Dear (Insert Facilitator's Name),


As you may recall, you recently agreed to participate in a brief online survey regarding your perceptions of the importance and changeability of various beliefs and personal characteristics of the IC Facilitator.  As a member of a finite pool of professionals with a unique role and skill set, your input will provide vital insight into the experiences and characteristics of the IC Facilitator. My advisor is Dr. Sylvia Rosenfield. This study was approved for data collection by the institutional review board at The University of Maryland.

Please visit  https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/W9SYB2S to read the informed consent form and to begin the survey. Participation is voluntary and you may stop the survey at any time.

To thank you for your time and participation, eight facilitators will be randomly selected to receive a $25 Amazon gift certificate.  If you would like to be entered into the raffle, please type your email address into the field on the last page of the survey.


Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns at Megan.Vaganek@gmail.com .

Thank you,
Megan Vaganek

**Appendix I: Survey Reminder Email**

Dear (Insert Facilitator's Name),


As you may recall, you recently agreed to participate in a brief online survey regarding your perceptions of the importance and changeability of various beliefs and personal characteristics of the IC Facilitator. My advisor is Dr. Sylvia Rosenfield. This study was approved for data collection by the institutional review board at The University of Maryland.

Please visit  https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/W9SYB2S to read the informed consent form and to begin the survey. Participation is voluntary and you may stop the survey at any time.

To thank you for your time and participation, eight facilitators will be randomly selected to receive a $25 Amazon gift certificate. If you would like to be entered into the raffle, please type your email address into the field on the last page of the survey.


Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns at

Megan.Vaganek@gmail.com .


Thank you,
Megan Vaganek

**Appendix J: Email to Non-Responders**

Dear (Insert Facilitator's Name),

 This is a reminder requesting your participation in a brief 10-15 minute online survey about the importance and changeability of various beliefs and characteristics necessary for IC Facilitators.  Your input is valuable and will lead to an increased understanding of your unique role as an IC Facilitator.

 Please click here  https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/W9SYB2S to read the informed consent information and to begin the survey.  Participation is voluntary and your information will be kept confidential, as identifying information, such as names and email addresses will be deleted before data analysis.

 As a thank you, you are eligible for entry in a raffle for one of eight $25 Amazon gift cards after the completion of your survey.  If you choose to be entered into the raffle, please include your email address on the last page of the survey.

 **The survey will be closed on September 1, 2014  Please feel free to contact me at Megan.Vaganek@gmail.com with questions or concerns.**


Thank you for your time.

Megan Vaganek




**Appendix K: Final Reminder Email**

Dear (Insert Facilitator's Name),

This is a **final** reminder requesting your participation in a brief 10-15 minute online survey about the importance and changeability of various beliefs and characteristics necessary for IC Facilitators.  As a member of a finite pool of IC Facilitators, your insight it vital to better understanding the unique role. Please consider sharing your valuable insights regarding the beliefs and characteristics of the IC Facilitator.

Please click here  https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/W9SYB2S to read the informed consent information and to begin the survey.  Participation is voluntary and your information will be kept confidential, as identifying information, such as names and email addresses will be deleted before data analysis.

As a thank you, you are eligible for entry in a raffle for one of eight $25 Amazon gift cards after the completion of your survey.  If you choose to be entered into the raffle, please include your email address on the last page of the survey.

**This email is the final reminder for this survey of IC Facilitators.  The survey will be closed on September 1, 2014.  Please feel free to contact me at Megan.Vaganek@gmail.com with questions or concerns.**

 Thank you for your time,

Megan Vaganek

**Appendix L: Survey Participant Informed Consent**

| Project Title | A Survey of the Instructional Consultation Teams Facilitator : Full Survey Study. |
|---|---|
| **Purpose of the Study** | This research is being conducted by Megan Vaganek, MA, Doctoral Student and Principle Investigator, University of Maryland, College Park. William Strein, EdD is the faculty advisor. You are invited to participate in this research project because you are currently an Instructional Consultation Team Facilitator. The purpose of this research project is to better understand the importance and changeability of facilitator characteristics and beliefs. You will be asked rate the importance and changeability of tasks, knowledge, skills, abilities, characteristics, and beliefs that may be associated with your current role as an IC Facilitator. This survey study of IC Facilitators will contribute to a body of research on IC Teams and facilitation. Insights from this research may contribute to advances in training, selection and retention of IC Facilitators and the successful implementation of IC Teams in schools. |
| **Procedures** | The procedures of this study involve participation in an online survey. You will be asked to think about the critical aspects of implementing IC Teams and rate the importance of a variety of statements regarding knowledge, skills, abilities, tasks, beliefs and characteristics associated with the IC Facilitator. You will then be asked to think of your own beliefs and your training and experiences with IC Teams facilitation. You will rate on scale of on a scale of 1 to 3, the changeability through training and experience of a variety of traits and beliefs. Finally, you will be asked to share demographic information about yourself and information about the nature of your school and team. |
| **Potential Risks and Discomforts** | The risks of participating in this online survey study are minimal. As a participant, you will be asked rate the importance and changeability of tasks, knowledge, skills, abilities, characteristics, and beliefs that may be associated with your current employment as an IC Facilitator. You may experience psychological discomfort discussing issues relevant to job satisfaction, assessment of skills, and overall experience as a facilitator. You will be informed of the risks to confidentiality. There are no known physical, financial, social, or legal risks associated with participation in this research. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | You may choose not to answer any questions and can remove themselves from the study at any time, without penalty. |
| **Potential Benefits** | You can expect no direct benefits as a result of their voluntary participation. |
| **Confidentiality** | Any loss of confidentiality will be minimized by the removal of email addresses from the data set prior to data analysis. Reports and/or articles about this research project will protect your identity to the maximum extent possible. Participant information may be shared with representatives at the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law. Every effort will be made to remove identifying information from results. |
| **Compensation** | As a thank you, eight participants who complete the survey and enter their email address will be randomly selected to receive a $25 Amazon gift certificate. You will be responsible for any taxes assessed on the compensation.<br><br>☐ Check here if you expect to earn $600 or more as a research participant in UMCP studies in this calendar year. You must provide your name, address and SSN to receive compensation.<br><br>☐ Check here if you do not expect to earn $600 or more as a research participant in UMCP studies in this calendar year. Your name, address, and SSN will not be collected to receive compensation. |
| **Right to Withdraw and Questions** | Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. You may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify.<br><br>If you decide to stop taking part in the study, if you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or if you need to report an injury related to the research, please contact the principle investigator, Megan Vaganek at the following: |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Address: 3214 Benjamin Building, College Park MD 20742;<br><br>Megan Vaganek at: megan.vaganek@gmail.com<br><br>You may also contact Dr. William Strein, Faculty Advisor at Strein@umd.edu |
| **Participant Rights** | If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact:<br><br>**University of Maryland College Park**<br><br>**Institutional Review Board Office**<br><br>**0101 Lee Building**<br><br>**College Park, Maryland, 20742**<br><br>**E-mail:** irb@umd.edu<br><br>**Telephone: 301-405-0678**<br><br>This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human subjects. |
| **Statement of Consent** | Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age; you have read this consent form or have had it read to you; your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. You will receive a copy of this signed consent form.<br><br>If you agree to participate, please sign your name below. |
| **Signature and Date** | NAME OF PARTICIPANT |
| | SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT |
| | DATE |

**Appendix M: Interview Informed Consent**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project Title** | A Survey of the Instructional Consultation Teams Facilitator: Interview For Survey Construction |

| Purpose of the Study | This research is being conducted by Megan Vaganek, MA, Doctoral Student and Principal Investigator, University of Maryland, College Park. William Strein, EdD is the faculty advisor. You are invited to participate in this research project because you have expertise and/or experience in the role and function of the Instructional Consultation Team Facilitator.  The purpose of this research project is to provide feedback on a survey instrument to be administered to Instructional Consultation Team Facilitators.  The survey assesses the importance and changeability of facilitator characteristics and beliefs. The subsequent survey study of IC Facilitators will contribute to a body of research on IC Teams and facilitation.  Insights from this research may contribute to advances in training, selection and retention of IC Facilitators and the successful implementation of IC Teams in schools. |
|---|---|
| Procedures | The procedures of this study will involve participating in an in-person or phone interview in which you will provide feedback on the online-survey instrument.  You will be asked to access the online survey and answer structured and open-ended questions about the survey design and items. Specifically, you will review the items for errors and will be asked to make suggestions regarding the addition, revision and deletion of survey items. Participants in the survey that you are being asked to review will be directed to think about the critical aspects of implementing IC Teams and rate the importance of a variety of statements regarding knowledge, skills, abilities, tasks, beliefs and characteristics associated with the IC Facilitator. Participants will then be asked to think of their own beliefs and your training and experiences with IC Teams facilitation.  They will rate on scale of on a scale of 1 to 3, the changeability through training and experience of a variety of traits and beliefs. Finally, participants will be asked to share demographic information about yourself and information about the nature of your school and team. |
| Potential Risks and Discomforts | The risks of participating in this interview study are minimal. As a professional with expertise in Instructional Consultation teams, you will be asked to provide feedback regarding you understanding of online survey questions before the survey is presented to Instructional Consultation Facilitators. You will be asked to provide feedback regarding clarity and utility of survey items. Survey questions focus on the importance and changeability of tasks, knowledge, skills, abilities, characteristics, and beliefs that may be |

| | associated with IC Facilitation. You will be informed of the risks to confidentiality. There are no known physical, financial, social, or legal risks associated with participation in this research. You may choose not to answer any questions and can remove yourself from the study at any time, without penalty. |
|---|---|
| **Potential Benefits** | You can expect no direct benefits as a result of you voluntary participation |
| **Confidentiality** | Your identify will be known to the principal investigator and the dissertation committee. Reports and/or articles about this research project will protect your identity to the maximum extent possible. Participant information may be shared with representatives at the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities if you or someone else is in danger or if we are required to do so by law. Click here to enter text. |
| **Compensation** | No compensation will be provided for your voluntary participation. |
| **Right to Withdraw and Questions** | Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. You may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalized or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify. <br><br> If you decide to stop taking part in the study, if you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or if you need to report an injury related to the research, please contact the principle investigator, Megan Vaganek at the following: <br><br> Address: 3214 Benjamin Building, College Park MD 20742; <br><br> Megan Vaganek at: megan.vaganek@gmail.com <br><br> You may also contact Dr. William Strein, Faculty Advisor at Strein@umd.edu |
| **Participant Rights** | If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact: <br><br> **University of Maryland College Park** <br><br> **Institutional Review Board Office** <br><br> **0101 Lee Building** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **College Park, Maryland, 20742** <br><br> **E-mail:** irb@umd.edu <br><br> **Telephone: 301-405-0678** <br><br> This research has been reviewed according to the University of Maryland, College Park IRB procedures for research involving human subjects |
| **Statement of Consent** | Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age; you have read this consent form or have had it read to you; your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. Yu will receive a copy of this signed consent form. <br><br> If you agree to participate, please sign your name below. |
| **Signature and Date** | NAME OF PARTICIPANT |
| | SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT |
| | DATE |

**Appendix N: Chi Square Tables- Experience Level**

Table N1.

*Know principles of learning & behavior for children by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.379 | 0.552 | 0.065 |
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 12 | 28 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.1 | 15.9 | 28.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 33 | 53 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 30.0 | 53.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N2.

*Know Best Practice in Instruction by experience level.*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 17 | 23 | 3.871 | 0.049 | 0.216 |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 13.0 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 30 | 30 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 34.0 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N3.

*Know principals of learning & behavior for adults by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 8 | 8 | 16 | 0.354 | 0.112 | 0.23 |
| | Expected Count | 6.9 | 9.1 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 28 | 39 | 67 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 29.1 | 37.9 | 67.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N4.

*Know content/curriculum by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.024 | 0.364 | 0.156 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 21 | 34 | 55 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.9 | 31.1 | 55.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 12 | 25 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.8 | 14.2 | 25.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N5.

*Know IC process/philosophy by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.321 | 0.25 | 0.126 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.6 | 46.4 | 82.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N6.

*Know about change process by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7.929 | 0.019 | 0.309 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 17 | 9 | 26 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 14.7 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 37 | 56 | | | |

|  | | Novice | Veteran | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Expected Count | 24.3 | 31.7 | 56.0 |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 |
|  | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 |

Table N7.

*Know about team dynamics & team functioning by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 7 | 13 | 0.049 | 0.826 | 0.024 |
|  | Expected Count | 5.6 | 7.4 | 13.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 30 | 40 | 70 | | | |
|  | Expected Count | 30.4 | 39.6 | 70.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
|  | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N8.

*Believe IC can work by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 3 | 9 | 12 | 1.928 | 0.165 | 0.152 |
|  | Expected Count | 5.2 | 6.8 | 12.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 33 | 38 | 71 | | | |
|  | Expected Count | 30.8 | 40.2 | 71.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
|  | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N9.

*Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 4 | 4 | 8 | | | |
|  | Expected Count | 3.4 | 4.6 | 8.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 26 | 42 | 0.6 | 0.741 | 0.086 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 17.6 | 24.4 | 42.0 |
| Essential | Count | 14 | 17 | 31 |
| | Expected Count | 13.0 | 18.0 | 31.0 |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 3.36.

Table N10.

*Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 14 | 27 | 41 | 2.324 | 0.313 | 0.169 |
| | Expected Count | 17.2 | 23.8 | 41.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 17 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 20.3 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 2.1 | 2.9 | 5.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 2.10.

Table N11.

*Believe that all school staff have valuable expertise by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 11 | 12 | 23 | 0.451 | 0.502 | 0.075 |
| | Expected Count | 9.7 | 13.3 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 35 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.3 | 33.7 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

Table N 12.

*Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 8 | 15 | 0.081 | 0.776 | 0.031 |
| | Expected Count | 6.5 | 8.5 | 15.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 29 | 39 | 68 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 29.5 | 38.5 | 68.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N13.

*Have strong classroom management skills (e.g. as a classroom teacher)by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 5 | 7 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 24 | 29 | 53 | 0.703 | 0.704 | 0.092 |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 30.0 | 53.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 10 | 13 | 23 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 13.0 | 23.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.04.

Table N14.

*Have strong group facilitation/group process skills by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 12 | 24 | 0.604 | 0.437 | 0.085 |
| | Expected Count | 10.4 | 13.6 | 24.0 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Essential | Count | 24 | 35 | 59 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.6 | 33.4 | 59.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N15.

*Have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 6 | 18 | 5.078 | 0.024 | 0.247 |
| | Expected Count | 7.8 | 10.2 | 18.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 41 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 28.2 | 36.8 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N16.

*Have completed IC training in case management by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 5 | 6 | 11 | 0.022 | 0.881 | 0.016 |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 6.2 | 11.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 31 | 41 | 72 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 31.2 | 40.8 | 72.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.77.

Table N17.

*Manage and analyze data on the computer by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | | | |

| | | | | | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 2.2 | 2.8 | 5.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 31 | 33 | 64 | 3.436 | 0.179 | 0.203 |
| | Expected Count | 27.8 | 36.2 | 64.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 3 | 11 | 14 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.1 | 7.9 | 14.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.17.

Table N18.

*Model effective case management by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0.278 | 0.598 | 0.058 |
| | Expected Count | 6.9 | 9.1 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 30 | 37 | 67 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 29.1 | 37.9 | 67.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N19

*Engage in problem solving process (as a case manager) by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 3 | 10 | 3.282 | 0.07 | 0.119 |
| | Expected Count | 4.3 | 5.7 | 10.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 29 | 44 | 73 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 31.7 | 41.3 | 73.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N20.

*Complete Instructional Assessments for trained case managers by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 8 | 8 | 16 | 1.148 | 0.563 | 0.118 |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 9.2 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 31 | 50 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.3 | 28.7 | 50.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N21.

*Sit with case managers during meetings with consultees by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 9 | 15 | 24 | 1.382 | 0.501 | 0.129 |
| | Expected Count | 10.4 | 13.6 | 24.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 20 | 20 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.3 | 22.7 | 40.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 12 | 19 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.2 | 10.8 | 19.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N22.

*Have a capacity for relationship-building by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 4 | 6 | 10 | 0.053 | 0.818 | 0.025 |
| | Expected Count | 4.3 | 5.7 | 10.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 32 | 41 | 73 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 31.7 | 41.3 | 73.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.34.

Table N23.

*Be trustworthy by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0.682 | 0.409 | 0.091 |
| | Expected Count | 3.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 34 | 42 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 33.0 | 43.0 | 76.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.04.

Table N 24.

*Be able to take another person's perspective by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0.158 | 0.691 | 0.044 |
| | Expected Count | 3.5 | 4.5 | 8.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 32 | 43 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 32.5 | 42.5 | 75.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.47.

Table N25.

*Be a reflective practitioner by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 7 | 4 | 11 | 2.21 | 0.145 | 0.16 |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 6.2 | 11.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 29 | 43 | 72 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 31.2 | 40.8 | 72.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

| | Count | | | | | | |

1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.77.

Table N 26.

*Have strong communication skills by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 2 | 9 | 4.865 | 0.027 | 0.242 |
| | Expected Count | 3.9 | 5.1 | 9.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 29 | 45 | 74 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 32.1 | 41.9 | 74.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.90.

Table N27.

*Manage and prioritize your time by experience level by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 11 | 23 | 1.003 | 0.317 | 0.11 |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 13.0 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 36 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 34.0 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

N28.

*Keep others (adults) on tasks by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.323 | 0.516 | 0.126 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 24 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected | 18.2 | 23.8 | 42.0 | | | |

| | Count | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Essential | Count | 17 | 23 | 40 |
| | Expected Count | 17.3 | 22.7 | 40.0 |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

N29.

*Have strong organizational skills of physical space and materials by experience level.*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.301 | 0.116 | 0.228 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 20 | 31 | 51 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.1 | 28.9 | 51.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 16 | 29 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.6 | 16.4 | 29.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

Table N30.

*Be able to multi-task in your role as facilitator by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1.704 | 0.427 | 0.143 |
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 11 | 24 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.4 | 13.6 | 24.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 35 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.7 | 32.3 | 57.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .87.

Table N31.

*Be flexible, as an attitude by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 11 | 23 | 1.003 | 0.317 | 0.11 |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 13.0 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 36 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 34.0 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N32.

*Be able to see the bigger picture by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 11 | 10 | 21 | 0.929 | 0.335 | 0.106 |
| | Expected Count | 9.1 | 11.9 | 21.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 25 | 37 | 62 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.9 | 35.1 | 62.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N33.

*Be able to break down tasks into smaller parts by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 14 | 15 | 29 | 0.436 | 0.509 | 0.072 |
| | Expected Count | 12.6 | 16.4 | 29.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 32 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.4 | 30.6 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Count

Table N34.

*Receive negative feedback about IC by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 19 | 19 | 38 | 1.253 | 0.263 | 0.123 |
| | Expected Count | 16.5 | 21.5 | 38.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 28 | 45 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.5 | 25.5 | 45.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N35.

*Help others to reflect on their practices by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0.499 | 0.48 | 0.078 |
| | Expected Count | 8.6 | 11.4 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 25 | 36 | 61 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.4 | 34.6 | 61.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 46 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 46.0 | 81.0 | | | |

Table N36.

*Be able to read other people (e.g. read social cues; social insight) as a team facilitator by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 18 | 18 | 36 | 0.969 | 0.325 | 0.109 |
| | Expected Count | 15.8 | 20.2 | 36.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 18 | 28 | 46 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.2 | 25.8 | 46.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 46 | 82 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Expected Count | 36.0 | 46.0 | 82.0 | |

Table N37.

*Be a self-starter by experience level.*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.253 | 0.197 | 0.198 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 14 | 12 | 26 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 14.7 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 21 | 35 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.3 | 31.7 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N38.

*Help team members to feel safe and certain by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.486 | 0.476 | 0.134 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 9 | 14 | 23 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 13.0 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 26 | 33 | 59 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.6 | 33.4 | 59.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N39.

*Be willing to take professional risks by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.811 | 0.404 | 0.148 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |

| Important | Count | 13 | 14 | 27 |
| | Expected Count | 11.7 | 15.3 | 27.0 |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 33 | 55 |
| | Expected Count | 23.9 | 31.1 | 55.0 |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.


Table N40.

*Respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.379 | 0.502 | 0.129 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 9 | 11 | 20 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.7 | 11.3 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 26 | 36 | 62 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.9 | 35.1 | 62.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.


Table N41.

*Manage conflict between IC Teams and other programs by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0.887 | 0.642 | 0.103 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 15 | 18 | 33 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.3 | 18.7 | 33.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 28 | 47 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.4 | 26.6 | 47.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.30.

Table N42.

*Manage conflict between team members by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 14 | 19 | 33 | 0.02 | 0.887 | 0.16 |
| | Expected Count | 14.3 | 18.7 | 33.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 28 | 50 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.7 | 28.3 | 50.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | 0.016 |

Table N43.

*Be able to work with people with different personalities by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 6 | 6 | 12 | 0.308 | 0.579 | 0.061 |
| | Expected Count | 5.1 | 6.9 | 12.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 29 | 41 | 70 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 29.9 | 40.1 | 70.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N44.

*Help staff create and work towards a common goal by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 12 | 14 | 26 | 0.119 | 0.73 | 0.038 |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 14.7 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 33 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.7 | 32.3 | 57.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N45.

*Align program goals of IC with other school initiatives and vision by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.563 | 0.458 | 0.137 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 13 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.1 | 11.9 | 21.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 27 | 34 | 61 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.5 | 34.5 | 61.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N46.

*Choose or have influence over the choice of team members that will be supportive of IC by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1.791 | 0.48 | 0.148 |
| | Expected Count | 2.6 | 3.4 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 21 | 26 | 47 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.1 | 26.9 | 47.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 16 | 29 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.4 | 16.6 | 29.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.56.

Table N47.

*Choose team members with expertise in data collection, interventions, or curriculum by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 14 | 16 | 30 | 3.493 | 0.174 | 0.206 |
| | Expected Count | 12.8 | 17.2 | 30.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 29 | 45 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 25.8 | 45.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 5 | 2 | 7 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 3.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.99.

Table N48.

*Choose team members who are open to learning new skills by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 11 | 12 | 23 | 0.346 | 0.557 | 0.065 |
| | Expected Count | 9.8 | 13.2 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 35 | 59 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.2 | 33.8 | 59.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N49.

*Assess team members' skills and need by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 20 | 17 | 37 | 3.563 | 0.059 | 0.208 |
| | Expected Count | 15.8 | 21.2 | 37.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 30 | 45 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 25.8 | 45.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N50.

*Set goals and expectations for the team by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 17 | 29 | 0.031 | 0.86 | 0.019 |
| | Expected Count | 12.4 | 16.6 | 29.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 30 | 53 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.6 | 30.4 | 53.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N51.

*Delegate meeting roles and responsibilities by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.112 | 0.945 | 0.037 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 19 | 25 | 44 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.8 | 25.2 | 44.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 20 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.9 | 20.1 | 35.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.28.

Table N52.

*Facilitate the team meeting yourself by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 10 | 17 | 27 | 5.12 | 0.077 | 0.25 |
| | Expected Count | 11.5 | 15.5 | 27.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 28 | 46 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.6 | 26.4 | 46.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 2 | 9 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.8 | 5.2 | 9.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.84.

Table N53.

*Have a co-facilitator during meetings by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 7 | 15 | 22 | 1.646 | 0.439 | 0.143 |
| | Expected Count | 9.5 | 12.5 | 22.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 21 | 24 | 45 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 19.4 | 25.6 | 45.0 |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| | Expected Count | 6.0 | 8.0 | 14.0 |
| Total | Count | 35 | 46 | 81 |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 46.0 | 81.0 |

Table N54.
*Cover classes so teacher/case manager can meet by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6.847 | 0.033 | 0.291 |
| | Expected Count | 2.5 | 3.5 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 19 | 16 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 20.3 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 25 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.8 | 23.2 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.52.

Table N55.

*Provide coaching on team members' cases by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.359 | 0.507 | 0.129 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 18 | 31 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.2 | 17.8 | 31.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 21 | 29 | 50 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.3 | 28.7 | 50.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N56.

*Facilitate IC Team Meetings by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.311 | 0.191 | 0.201 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 12 | 25 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.8 | 21.2 | 37.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 20 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.9 | 24.1 | 42.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.28.

Table N57.

*Provide non-evaluative feedback to team members by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 15 | 16 | 31 | 0.663 | 0.416 | 0.09 |
| | Expected Count | 13.2 | 17.8 | 31.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 31 | 51 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.8 | 29.2 | 51.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N58.

*Train new team members by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.13 | 0.568 | 0.117 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 8 | 16 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 9.2 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 27 | 38 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 27.7 | 37.3 | 65.0 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N59.

*Plan tech support for the school district by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 17 | 27 | 44 | 6.366 | 0.041 | 0.28 |
| | Expected Count | 18.5 | 25.5 | 44.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 12 | 28 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.8 | 16.2 | 28.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 1 | 8 | 9 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.8 | 5.2 | 9.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.78.

Table N60.

*Provide on-going training to team members experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.768 | 0.681 | 0.097 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 10 | 18 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.7 | 10.3 | 18.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 27 | 36 | 63 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.9 | 36.1 | 63.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N61.

*Provide on-going support to team members after they have been trained to take*

*cases by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.789 | 0.674 | 0.098 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 9 | 11 | 20 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.5 | 11.5 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 26 | 35 | 61 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 35.0 | 61.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N62.

*Fulfill Systems Manager Role by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 9 | 20 | 29 | 2.495 | 0.287 | 0.174 |
| | Expected Count | 12.4 | 16.6 | 29.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 19 | 20 | 39 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.6 | 22.4 | 39.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 7 | 14 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.0 | 8.0 | 14.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N63.

*Delegate the Systems Manager Role by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 8 | 8 | 16 | 2.286 | 0.319 | 0.168 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 6.7 | 9.3 | 16.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 30 | 46 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.3 | 26.7 | 46.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 10 | 9 | 19 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.0 | 11.0 | 19.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

Table N64.

*Maintain IC Teams meeting climate by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 16 | 15 | 31 | 1.625 | 0.202 | 0.141 |
| | Expected Count | 13.2 | 17.8 | 31.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 32 | 51 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.8 | 29.2 | 51.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N65.

*Manage the team's schedule by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0.195 | 0.907 | 0.049 |
| | Expected Count | 3.4 | 4.6 | 8.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 22 | 38 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.2 | 21.8 | 38.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 21 | 36 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.4 | 20.6 | 36.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N67.

*Distribute new cases by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 5 | 8 | 1.916 | 0.384 | 0.153 |
| | Expected Count | 3.4 | 4.6 | 8.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 17 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.9 | 20.1 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 14 | 25 | 39 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.6 | 22.4 | 39.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.41.

Table N68.

*Assign difficult cases or consultees to yourself by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 14 | 19 | 33 | 0.246 | 0.884 | 0.055 |
| | Expected Count | 14.1 | 18.9 | 33.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 17 | 21 | 38 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.2 | 21.8 | 38.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 4 | 7 | 11 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.7 | 6.3 | 11.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.70.

Table N69.

*Create material for case management by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 8 | 12 | 20 | 0.402 | 0.818 | 0.07 |
| | Expected Count | 8.6 | 11.4 | 20.0 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 19 | 26 | 45 |
| | Expected Count | 19.4 | 25.6 | 45.0 |
| Essential | Count | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| | Expected Count | 6.9 | 9.1 | 16.0 |
| Total | Count | 35 | 46 | 81 |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 46.0 | 81.0 |

Table N70.

*Create material for training by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.952 | 0.621 | 0.108 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 20 | 24 | 44 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.8 | 25.2 | 44.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 22 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.8 | 21.2 | 37.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N71.

*Complete paperwork and administrative tasks by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2.335 | 0.311 | 0.169 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 17 | 22 | 39 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.6 | 22.4 | 39.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 18 | 22 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.1 | 22.9 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.28.

Table N72.

*Encourage teachers to use IC by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1.365 | 0.505 | 0.129 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 7 | 10 | 17 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.3 | 9.7 | 17.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 27 | 37 | 64 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 27.3 | 36.7 | 64.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N73.

*Present to staff at the beginning of the year about Instructional Consultation Teams by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1.562 | 0.458 | 0.139 |
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 14 | 25 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.8 | 14.2 | 25.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 30 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.3 | 30.7 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 46 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 46.0 | 81.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .86.

Table N74.

*Provide regular, on-going training on IC to school staff by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1.803 | 0.406 | 0.148 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| Important | Count | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| | Expected Count | 12.8 | 17.2 | 30.0 |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 27 | 50 |
| | Expected Count | 21.3 | 28.7 | 50.0 |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .85.

Table N75.

*Advocate for the team in school by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 10 | 11 | 21 | 0.225 | 0.636 | 0.053 |
| | Expected Count | 9.1 | 11.9 | 21.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 25 | 35 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.9 | 34.1 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 46 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 46.0 | 81.0 | | | |

Table N76.

*Engage in community-building activities (e.g. participate in field day, etc) by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0.921 | 0.631 | 0.106 |
| | Expected Count | 8.5 | 11.5 | 20.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 24 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.9 | 24.1 | 42.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 13 | 20 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.5 | 11.5 | 20.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N77.

*Engage in non-IC school-related tasks (e.g. proctor standardized tests; bus/hall/cafeteria*

*duty; etc.) by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 13 | 15 | 28 | 1.388 | 0.5 | 0.13 |
| | Expected Count | 12.0 | 16.0 | 28.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 22 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.1 | 22.9 | 40.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 4 | 10 | 14 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.0 | 8.0 | 14.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N78.

*Engage in district-level program development tasks by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0.248 | 0.883 | 0.056 |
| | Expected Count | 2.5 | 3.5 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 17 | 26 | 43 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.7 | 25.3 | 43.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 18 | 31 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.8 | 18.2 | 31.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 33 | 47 | 80 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 33.0 | 47.0 | 80.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.

Table N79

*Communicate with administrator regularly by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 7 | 16 | 1.857 | 0.173 | 0.152 |

| | | Novice | Veteran | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 6.6 | 9.4 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 40 | 64 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.4 | 37.6 | 64.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 33 | 47 | 80 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 33.0 | 47.0 | 80.0 | | | |

Table 80

*Discuss sustainability and expectations of IC with administrator by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 6 | 15 | 2.678 | 0.102 | 0.183 |
| | Expected Count | 6.2 | 8.8 | 15.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 41 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.8 | 38.2 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 33 | 47 | 80 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 33.0 | 47.0 | 80.0 | | | |

Table N81.

*Present information about IC to administrators or school board by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1.301 | 0.522 | 0.128 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 2.4 | 4.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 17 | 19 | 36 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.9 | 21.2 | 36.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 14 | 26 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.5 | 23.5 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 33 | 47 | 80 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 33.0 | 47.0 | 80.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.65.

Table N82.

*Receive summative evaluation from administrator(s)by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0.191 | 0.909 | 0.05 |
| | Expected Count | 3.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 19 | 28 | 47 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.9 | 27.1 | 47.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 11 | 13 | 24 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.2 | 13.8 | 24.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 33 | 45 | 78 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 33.0 | 45.0 | 78.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.96.

Table N83.

*Attend and participate in facilitator trainings and meetings by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.342 | 0.511 | 0.127 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 9 | 15 | 24 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.4 | 13.6 | 24.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 27 | 31 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.2 | 32.8 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N84.

*Attend networking/district-level facilitator meetings by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1.23 | 0.541 | 0.122 |
| | Expected Count | 2.2 | 2.8 | 5.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 19 | 30 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.0 | 17.0 | 30.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 26 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.8 | 27.2 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N85.

*Collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 10 | 17 | 27 | 0.77 | 0.38 | 0.097 |
| | Expected Count | 11.9 | 15.1 | 27.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 26 | 29 | 55 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.1 | 30.9 | 55.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 46 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 46.0 | 82.0 | | | |

Table N86.

*Engage in other professional development activities on my own to build my skills as a*

*facilitator by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.151 | 0.927 | 0.043 |
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 15 | 18 | 33 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.3 | 18.7 | 33.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 28 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.8 | 27.2 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Table N87.

*Item: Complete Level of Implementation (LOI) end-of-year evaluation tasks by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0.492 | 0.782 | 0.077 |
| | Expected Count | 3.4 | 4.6 | 8.0 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 14 | 26 |
| | Expected Count | 11.1 | 14.9 | 26.0 |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 29 | 48 |
| | Expected Count | 20.5 | 27.5 | 48.0 |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 3.41.

Table N88.

*Review Level of Implementation (LOI) data to inform team goals, planning, etc. by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3.827 | 0.148 | 0.219 |
| | Expected Count | 2.6 | 3.5 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 12 | 8 | 20 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.5 | 11.5 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 35 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 31.1 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 46 | 80 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 46.0 | 80.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 2.55.

Table N89.

*Use ICAT Tools for data entry and feedback by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5.629 | 0.06 | 0.262 |
| | Expected Count | 2.6 | 3.4 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 18 | 12 | 30 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.2 | 16.8 | 30.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 31 | 46 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.2 | 25.8 | 46.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 46 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected | 36.0 | 46.0 | 82.0 | | | |

| | Count | | | | | | |

*Note*. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 2.63.

Table N90.

*Coach others online by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 15 | 19 | 34 | 3.6 | 0.165 | 0.208 |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 19.3 | 34.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 20 | 21 | 41 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.8 | 23.2 | 41.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 1 | 7 | 8 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.5 | 4.5 | 8.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Note. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 3.47

Table N91.

*Develop a support network for facilitators within your district by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.208 | 0.332 | 0.163 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 21 | 22 | 43 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.7 | 24.3 | 43.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 24 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.0 | 21.0 | 37.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

Note. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 1.30

Table N92.

*Changeable: Having a capacity for relationship-building by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | 0.406 | 0.816 | 0.07 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 2 | 4 | 6 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 2.6 | 3.4 | 6.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 24 | 32 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.3 | 31.7 | 56.0 | | | |
| Very changeable by | Count | 10 | 11 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.1 | 11.9 | 21.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.60.

Table N93.

*Changeable: Being trustworthy by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 15 | 19 | 34 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 19.3 | 34.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 18 | 20 | 38 | 1.416 | 0.493 | 0.131 |
| | Expected Count | 16.5 | 21.5 | 38.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 3 | 8 | 11 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 6.2 | 11.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.77.

Table N94.

*Changeable:  Being able to take another person's perspective by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 2 | 4 | 6 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 2.6 | 3.4 | 6.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 22 | 31 | 53 | 0.75 | 0.687 | 0.095 |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 30.0 | 53.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 12 | 12 | 24 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.4 | 13.6 | 24.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.60.

Table N95.

*Changeable: Being a reflective practitioner by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1.597 | 0.45 | 0.139 |
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 11 | 13 | 24 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.4 | 13.6 | 24.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 25 | 32 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.7 | 32.3 | 57.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .87.

Table N96.

*Changeable: Believe IC can work by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.19 | 0.552 | 0.12 |
| | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 9 | 9 | 18 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.7 | 10.3 | 18.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 26 | 37 | 63 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.9 | 36.1 | 63.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

Table N97.

*Changeable: Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability by experience*

*level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1.761 | 0.415 | 0.147 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 23 | 24 | 47 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.1 | 26.9 | 47.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 11 | 21 | 32 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.7 | 18.3 | 32.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 35 | 47 | 82 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 35.0 | 47.0 | 82.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.28.

Table N98.

*Changeable: Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | Expected Count | .8 | 1.2 | 2.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 27 | 31 | 58 | 2.101 | 0.35 | 0.161 |
| | Expected Count | 24.3 | 33.7 | 58.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 6 | 15 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.8 | 12.2 | 21.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 34 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 34.0 | 47.0 | 81.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .84.

Table N99.

*Changeable: Believe that all staff have valuable expertise by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 3 | 1 | 4 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 2.3 | 4.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 21 | 16 | 37 | 8.074 | 0.018 | 0.312 |
| | Expected Count | 16.0 | 21.0 | 37.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 12 | 30 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.2 | 23.8 | 42.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 | | | |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.73.

Table N100.

*Changeable: Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers by experience level*

| Rating | | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | Expected Count | .9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 17 | 17 | 34 | 1.137 | 0.566 | 0.117 |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 19.3 | 34.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 18 | 29 | 47 | | | |

|  |  | Novice | Veteran | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Expected Count | 20.4 | 26.6 | 47.0 |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 |
|  | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .87

Table N100.

*Changeable: Believe that team member's beliefs can be changed by experience level*

| Rating |  | Novice | Veteran | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
|  | Expected Count | .4 | .6 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 23 | 19 | 42 | 6.436 | 0.04 | 0.278 |
|  | Expected Count | 18.2 | 23.8 | 42.0 |  |  |  |
| Very changeable | Count | 12 | 28 | 40 |  |  |  |
|  | Expected Count | 17.3 | 22.7 | 40.0 |  |  |  |
| Total | Count | 36 | 47 | 83 |  |  |  |
|  | Expected Count | 36.0 | 47.0 | 83.0 |  |  |  |

2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

# Appendix M: Chi Square Tables- Phase

Table M1.
Item: Know principles of learning & behavior
for children

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 8 | 14 | 0.57 | 0.45 | 0.087 |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 9.2 | 14.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 42 | 62 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.2 | 40.8 | 62.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum
expected count is 4.79


Table M2.
Item:  Know Best Practice in
Instruction

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 4 | 14 | 18 | 1.506 | 0.22 | 0.141 |
| | Expected Count | 6.2 | 11.8 | 18.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 36 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.8 | 38.2 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.*  0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum
expected count is 6.16


Item: Know principals of learning & behavior
for adults

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.977 | 0.226 | 0.198 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | 0.7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 16 | 27 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 14 | 34 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M3.

Item: Know content/curriculum

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.625 | 0.099 | 0.247 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 12 | 35 | 47 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.1 | 30.9 | 47.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 12 | 14 | 26 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.9 | 17.1 | 26.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03

Table M4.

Item: Know IC process/philosophy

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.527 | 0.468 | 0.083 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.7 | 49.3 | 75.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M5.

Item: Know about change process

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.373 | 0.185 | 0.211 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 15 | 26 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.9 | 17.1 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 14 | 35 | 49 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.8 | 32.2 | 49.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M6.

Item: Know about team dynamics & team functioning

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 5 | 11 | 2.363 | 0.124 | 0.176 |
| | Expected Count | 3.8 | 7.2 | 11.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 45 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.2 | 42.8 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.76

Table M7.
Item: Believe IC can work

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0.003 | 0.953 | 0.007 |
| | Expected Count | 3.1 | 5.9 | 9.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 44 | 67 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.9 | 44.1 | 67.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.08.

Table M8.
Item: Believe that working hard has more influence on success than ability

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 6 | 2 | 8 | 7.062 | 0.029 | 0.307 |
| | Expected Count | 2.7 | 5.3 | 8.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 10 | 27 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.3 | 24.7 | 37.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 9 | 21 | 30 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note. One cell (16.7%) has expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.67*

Table M9.
Item: Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort

| Rating | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi | Significance | Cramer's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | Square | | V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 11 | 28 | 39 | 0.965 | 0.617 | 0.113 |
| | Expected Count | 13.0 | 26.0 | 39.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 12 | 19 | 31 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.3 | 20.7 | 31.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 1.67.

Table M10.
Item: Believe that all school staff have valuable expertise

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 4 | 15 | 19 | 1.727 | 0.189 | 0.152 |
| | Expected Count | 6.3 | 12.7 | 19.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 21 | 35 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.7 | 37.3 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Table M11.
Item: Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 4 | 11 | 4.948 | 0.026 | 0.255 |
| | Expected Count | 3.8 | 7.2 | 11.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 46 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.2 | 42.8 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

One cell (25%) has expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 3.76.

Table M12.
Item: Have strong classroom management skills (e.g. as a classroom teacher)

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 5 | 7 | 1.724 | 0.422 | 0.151 |
| | Expected | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |

| | Count | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 19 | 29 | 48 |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 |
| Essential | Count | 5 | 16 | 21 |
| | Expected Count | 7.2 | 13.8 | 21.0 |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 2.39

Table M13.
Item: Have strong group facilitation/group process skills

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 11 | 20 | 1.404 | 0.236 | 0.136 |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.2 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 39 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 36.8 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.*0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.84.

Table M14.
Item: Have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 7 | 13 | 0.994 | 0.319 | 0.114 |
| | Expected Count | 4.4 | 8.6 | 13.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 43 | 63 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.6 | 41.4 | 63.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.45

Table M15.
Item: Have completed IC training in case management

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0.003 | 0.953 | 0.007 |
| | Expected Count | 3.1 | 5.9 | 9.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 44 | 67 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.9 | 44.1 | 67.0 | | | |

| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.08.

Table M16.
Item: Manage and analyze data on the computer

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5.587 | 0.061 | 0.271 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 23 | 34 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.5 | 37.5 | 57.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 1 | 13 | 14 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 9.2 | 14.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Three cells (50%) have expected count lss than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.71.*

Table M17.
Item: Have completed IC training in case management

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 3 | 6 | 9 | .003 | .953 | .007 |
| | Expected Count | 3.1 | 5.9 | 9.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 44 | 67 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.9 | 44.1 | 67.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

* 1 cell has an expected count less than 5
(4.77)

Table M18.
Item: Have strong Instructional Consultation case management skills

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 7 | 13 | .994 | .319 | .114 |
| | Expected Count | 4.4 | 8.6 | 13.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 43 | 63 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.6 | 41.4 | 63.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M19.
Item: Have strong group facilitation/group process skills

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi | Significance | Cramer's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 11 | 20 | 1.404 | .236 | .136 |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.3 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 39 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 36.8 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M21.
Item: Have strong classroom management skills (e.g. as a classroom teacher)

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 5 | 7 | 1.724 | .422 | .008 |
| | Expected Count | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 19 | 29 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 5 | 16 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.2 | 13.8 | 21.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M22.
Item: Model effective case management

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 7 | 14 | 1.901 | 0.168 | 0.158 |
| | Expected Count | 4.8 | 9.2 | 14.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 43 | 62 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 21.2 | 40.8 | 62.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.79

Table M23.
Item: Engage in problem solving process (as a case manager)

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0.256 | 0.613 | 0.058 |
| | Expected Count | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 46 | 69 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.6 | 45.4 | 69.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.39.

Item: Complete Instructional Assessments for trained case managers

| Rating | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 9 | 7 | 16 | 4.541 | 0.103 | 0.244 |
| | Expected Count | 5.5 | 10.5 | 16.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 4 | 8 | 12 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.1 | 7.9 | 12.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 35 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. the minimum expected count is 4.11.

Table M24.
Item: Sit with case managers during meetings with consultees

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 9 | 14 | 23 | 0.374 | 0.83 | 0.07 |
| | Expected Count | 7.9 | 15.1 | 23.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 24 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.0 | 23.0 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 6 | 12 | 18 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.2 | 11.8 | 18.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.16

Table M25.
Item: Have a capacity for relationship-building

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7.062 | 0.029 | 0.307 |
| | Expected Count | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 45 | 69 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.6 | 45.4 | 69.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Two cells have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.4

Table M26.
Item: Be trustworthy

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0.48 | 0.488 | 0.079 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 25 | 46 | 71 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 24.3 | 46.7 | 71.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.71.

Table M27.
Item: Be able to take another person's perspective

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--|---------|---------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0.002 | 0.962 | 0.005 |
| | Expected Count | 2.1 | 3.9 | 6.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 24 | 46 | 70 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.9 | 46.1 | 70.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M28.
Item: Be a reflective practitioner

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--|---------|---------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 4 | 4 | 8 | 0.99 | 0.32 | 0.114 |
| | Expected Count | 2.7 | 5.3 | 8.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 46 | 68 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.3 | 44.7 | 68.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M29.
Item: Have strong communication skills

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--|---------|---------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0.256 | 0.613 | 0.058 |
| | Expected Count | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 23 | 46 | 69 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.6 | 45.4 | 69.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.39.

Table M30.
Item: Manage and prioritize your time

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--|---------|---------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Important | Count | 7 | 12 | 19 | 0.078 | 0.786 | 0.032 |
| | Expected Count | 6.5 | 12.5 | 19.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 38 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.5 | 37.5 | 57.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M31.
Item: Keep others (adults) on tasks

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|--------|--|---------|---------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.054 | 0.358 | 0.164 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 12 | 26 | 38 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.0 | 25.0 | 38.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 24 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.7 | 24.3 | 37.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M32.
Item: Have strong organizational skills of physical space and materials

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.639 | 0.267 | 0.186 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 33 | 46 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.7 | 30.3 | 46.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 11 | 16 | 27 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have an expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03.

Table M33.
Item: Be able to multi-task in your role as facilitator

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5.873 | 0.053 | 0.278 |
| | Expected Count | .7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 9 | 20 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.2 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 39 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.5 | 35.5 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76 | | | |

Two cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .68.

Table M34.
Item: Be flexible, as an attitude

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 5 | 15 | 20 | 1.023 | 0.312 | 0.116 |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.2 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 21 | 35 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 36.8 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.84

Table M35.
Item: Be able to see the bigger picture

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 12 | 18 | 0.008 | 0.928 | 0.01 |
| | Expected Count | 6.2 | 11.8 | 18.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 38 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.8 | 38.2 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 6.16.

Table M36.
Item: Be able to break down tasks into smaller parts

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 20 | 27 | 1.277 | 0.259 | 0.13 |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 30 | 49 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.8 | 32.2 | 49.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note*. 0 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 9.24.

Table M37.
Item: Receive negative feedback about IC

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 15 | 20 | 35 | 2.155 | 0.142 | 0.168 |
| | Expected Count | 12.0 | 23.0 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 11 | 30 | 41 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.0 | 27.0 | 41.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M38.
Item:  Help others to reflect on their practices

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 9 | 16 | 0.665 | 0.415 | 0.095 |
| | Expected Count | 5.6 | 10.4 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 39 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.4 | 37.6 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 48 | 74 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 48.0 | 74.0 | | | |

Table M39.
Item: Be able to read other people (e.g. read social cues; social insight) as a team facilitator

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 10 | 22 | 32 | 0.288 | 0.592 | 0.062 |
| | Expected Count | 11.1 | 20.9 | 32.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 16 | 27 | 43 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.9 | 28.1 | 43.0 | | | |

| | | | | | Chi | | Cramer's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Table M40.
Item: Be a self-starter

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.066 | 0.587 | 0.118 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 9 | 13 | 22 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.5 | 14.5 | 22.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 36 | 53 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.1 | 34.9 | 53.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.*2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is .34.

Table M 41.
Item: Help team members to feel safe and certain

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.55 | 0.76 | 0.085 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 7 | 14 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.2 | 13.8 | 21.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 35 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.5 | 35.5 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.*2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 42.
Item: Be willing to take professional risks

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.527 | 0.768 | 0.083 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 15 | 23 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.9 | 15.1 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 18 | 34 | 52 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.8 | 34.2 | 52.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

Table M 43.
Item: Respond to challenging situations and attitudes of adults

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.797 | 0.671 | 0.102 |

| | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 5 | 12 | 17 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.8 | 11.2 | 17.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 21 | 37 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.8 | 38.2 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. the minimum expected count is .34

Table M 44.
Item: Manage conflict between IC Teams and other programs

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.002 | 0.999 | 0.005 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 10 | 19 | 29 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.9 | 19.1 | 29.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 29 | 44 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.1 | 28.9 | 44.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  the minimum expected count is 1.03

Table M 45.
Item: Manage conflict between team members

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 11 | 17 | 28 | 0.507 | 0.476 | 0.082 |
| | Expected Count | 9.6 | 18.4 | 28.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 33 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M 46.
Item: Be able to work with people with different personalities

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 4 | 6 | 10 | 0.145 | 0.703 | 0.044 |
| | Expected Count | 3.5 | 6.5 | 10.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 43 | 65 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 22.5 | 42.5 | 65.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.47

Table M47.
Item: Help staff create and work towards a common goal

| Rating | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi | Significance | Cramer's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 16 | 22 | 0.662 | 0.416 | 0.093 |
| | Expected Count | 7.5 | 14.5 | 22.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 34 | 54 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.5 | 35.5 | 54.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 7.53.

Table M 48.
Item: Align program goals of IC with other school initiatives and vision

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.531 | 0.767 | 0.084 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 6 | 11 | 17 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.8 | 11.2 | 17.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 38 | 58 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.8 | 38.2 | 58.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34.

Table M 49.
Item: Choose or have influence over the choice of team members that will be supportive of IC

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0.642 | 0.725 | 0.092 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 27 | 43 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 28.3 | 43.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 8 | 20 | 28 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.6 | 18.4 | 28.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 1.71.

Table M 50.
Item: Choose team members with expertise in data collection, interventions, or curriculum

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 10 | 17 | 27 | 0.526 | 0.769 | 0.083 |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 29 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.4 | 27.6 | 42.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.39.

Table M 51.
Item: Choose team members who are open to learning new skills

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 11 | 20 | 1.404 | 0.236 | 0.136 |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.2 | 20.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 39 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 36.8 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.84.

Table M 52.
Item: Assess team members' skills and needs

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 11 | 20 | 31 | 0.038 | 0.846 | 0.022 |
| | Expected Count | 10.6 | 20.4 | 31.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 30 | 45 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.4 | 29.6 | 45.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.61.

Table M 53.
Item: Set goals and expectations for the team

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 17 | 26 | 0.003 | 0.957 | 0.006 |
| | Expected Count | 8.9 | 17.1 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 33 | 50 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.1 | 32.9 | 50.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.89

Table M 54.
Item: Delegate meeting roles and responsibilities

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.121 | 0.941 | 0.04 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 27 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.7 | 26.3 | 40.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 12 | 21 | 33 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 21.7 | 33.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03.

Table M 55.
Item: Facilitate the team meeting yourself

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 10 | 15 | 25 | 1.385 | 0.5 | 0.135 |
| | Expected Count | 8.6 | 16.4 | 25.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 12 | 30 | 42 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.4 | 27.6 | 42.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 4 | 5 | 9 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.1 | 5.9 | 9.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.08

Table M 56.
Item: Have a co-facilitator during meetings

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 6 | 15 | 21 | 1.881 | 0.39 | 0.158 |
| | Expected Count | 7.3 | 13.7 | 21.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 27 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.9 | 26.1 | 40.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 7 | 14 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.9 | 9.1 | 14.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.85

Table M 57.
Item: Cover classes so teacher/case manager can met

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 5 | 8 | 0.826 | 0.662 | 0.105 |
| | Expected Count | 2.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 10 | 22 | 32 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.7 | 21.3 | 32.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 12 | 25 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.3 | 24.7 | 37.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.00.

Table M58.
Item: Provide coaching on team members' cases

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.418 | 0.11 | 0.241 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |

| Important | Count | 14 | 15 | 29 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 9.9 | 19.1 | 29.0 |
| Essential | Count | 12 | 34 | 46 |
| | Expected Count | 15.7 | 30.3 | 46.0 |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 59.
Item: Facilitate IC Team Meetings

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.99 | 0.61 | 0.114 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 14 | 21 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.0 | 23.0 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 11 | 27 | 38 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.0 | 25.0 | 38.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03

Table M 60.
Item: Provide non-evaluative feedback to team members

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 9 | 19 | 28 | 0.084 | 0.772 | 0.033 |
| | Expected Count | 9.6 | 18.4 | 28.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 31 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M61.
Item: Train new team members

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.43 | 0.18 | 0.212 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 7 | 15 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.1 | 9.9 | 15.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 18 | 42 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.5 | 39.5 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 62.
Item: Plan tech support for the school district

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 17 | 26 | 43 | 4.744 | 0.093 | 0.252 |
| | Expected Count | 14.3 | 28.7 | 43.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 16 | 24 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.0 | 16.0 | 24.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 0 | 8 | 8 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 2.7 | 5.3 | 8.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.67

Table M 63.
Item: Provide on-going training to team members

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.599 | 0.741 | 0.089 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 6 | 10 | 16 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.5 | 10.5 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 39 | 59 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.2 | 38.8 | 59.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 64.
Item: Provide on-going support to team members after they have been trained to take cases

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.58 | 0.748 | 0.087 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 7 | 12 | 19 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.5 | 12.5 | 19.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 37 | 56 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.2 | 36.8 | 56.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 66.
Item: Fulfill Systems Manager Role

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 7 | 20 | 27 | 2.617 | 0.27 | 0.186 |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 16 | 21 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.7 | 24.3 | 37.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 3 | 9 | 12 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.1 | 7.9 | 12.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.11

Table M67.
Item: Delegate the Systems Manager Role

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 5 | 10 | 15 | 0.043 | 0.979 | 0.024 |
| | Expected Count | 5.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 15 | 29 | 44 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.7 | 29.3 | 44.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 5 | 11 | 16 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.6 | 10.7 | 16.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Table M68.
Item: Maintain IC Teams meeting climate

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 13 | 14 | 27 | 3.614 | 0.057 | 0.218 |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 36 | 49 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.8 | 32.2 | 49.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M69.
Item: Manage the team's schedule

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0.714 | 0.7 | 0.097 |
| | Expected Count | 2.4 | 4.6 | 7.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 22 | 35 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.0 | 23.0 | 35.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 10 | 24 | 34 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.6 | 22.4 | 34.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.39

Table M 70.
Item: Distribute new cases

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 6 | 8 | 0.338 | 0.845 | 0.067 |
| | Expected Count | 2.7 | 5.3 | 8.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 20 | 31 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.6 | 20.4 | 31.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 24 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.7 | 24.3 | 37.0 | | | |

| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.74

Table M71.
Item: Assign difficult cases or consultees to yourself

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 10 | 23 | 33 | 0.697 | 0.706 | 0.096 |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 21.7 | 33.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 20 | 33 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.3 | 21.7 | 33.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 3 | 7 | 10 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.4 | 6.6 | 10.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.42

Table M 72.
Item: Create material for case management

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 8 | 11 | 19 | 2.53 | 0.282 | 0.184 |
| | Expected Count | 6.6 | 12.4 | 19.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 30 | 41 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 14.2 | 26.8 | 41.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 7 | 8 | 15 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.2 | 9.8 | 15.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Table M 73.
Item: Create material for training

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.591 | 0.744 | 0.088 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 26 | 39 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.3 | 23.7 | 39.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 13 | 23 | 36 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.3 | 23.7 | 36.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 74.
Item: Complete paperwork and administrative
tasks

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2.432 | 0.296 | 0.179 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 11 | 25 | 36 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.3 | 23.7 | 36.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 15 | 22 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.7 | 24.3 | 37.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.03

Table M 75.
Item: Encourage teachers to use IC

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.871 | 0.144 | 0.226 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 3 | 13 | 16 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.5 | 10.5 | 16.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 37 | 59 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 20.2 | 38.8 | 59.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 76.
Item: Present to staff at the beginning of the year about Instructional Consultation Teams

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2.058 | 0.357 | 0.166 |
| | Expected Count | .7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 6 | 16 | 22 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.6 | 14.4 | 22.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 31 | 51 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.7 | 33.3 | 51.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .69

Table M 77.
Item: Provide regular, on-going training on IC to school staff

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.999 | 0.135 | 0.229 |
| | Expected Count | .7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 5 | 21 | 26 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 8.9 | 17.1 | 26.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 28 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .68

Table M 78.
Item: Advocate for the team in school

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 4 | 14 | 18 | 1.619 | 0.203 | 0.147 |
| | Expected Count | 6.2 | 11.8 | 18.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 22 | 35 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.8 | 37.2 | 57.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Table M79.
Item: Engage in community-building activities (e.g. participate in field day, etc)

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 7 | 13 | 20 | 0.012 | 0.994 | 0.012 |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 13.2 | 20.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 25 | 38 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.0 | 25.0 | 38.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 6 | 12 | 18 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.2 | 11.8 | 18.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 0 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.16

Table M 80.
Item: Engage in non-IC school-related tasks (e.g. proctor standardized tests; bus/hall/cafeteria duty; etc.)

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 8 | 19 | 27 | 1.363 | 0.506 | 0.134 |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 15 | 22 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.7 | 24.3 | 37.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 3 | 9 | 12 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 4.1 | 7.9 | 12.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.11

Table M 81.
Item: Engage in district-level program development tasks

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0.012 | 0.994 | 0.013 |
| | Expected Count | 1.9 | 4.1 | 6.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 12 | 26 | 38 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.0 | 26.0 | 38.0 | | | |

| | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Essential | Count | 9 | 20 | 29 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.1 | 19.9 | 29.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 23 | 50 | 73 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 50.0 | 73.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.89.

Table M 82.

Item: Communicate with administrator regularly

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 7 | 7 | 14 | 2.745 | 0.098 | 0.194 |
| | Expected Count | 4.4 | 9.6 | 14.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 16 | 43 | 59 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.6 | 40.4 | 59.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 23 | 50 | 73 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 50.0 | 73.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.41.

Table M 83.

Item: Discuss sustainability and expectations of IC with administrator

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 7 | 13 | 1.572 | 0.21 | 0.147 |
| | Expected Count | 4.1 | 8.9 | 13.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 17 | 43 | 60 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.9 | 41.1 | 60.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 23 | 50 | 73 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 50.0 | 73.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.10.

Table M84.

Item: Present information about IC to administrators or school board

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3.417 | 0.181 | 0.216 |
| | Expected Count | 1.3 | 2.7 | 4.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 13 | 19 | 32 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.1 | 21.9 | 32.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 10 | 27 | 37 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.7 | 25.3 | 37.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 23 | 50 | 73 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 23.0 | 50.0 | 73.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. the minimum expected count is 1.26.

Table M 85.

Item: Receive summative evaluation from administrator(s)

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1.023 | 0.6 | 0.12 |
| | Expected Count | 1.9 | 4.1 | 6.0 | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 15 | 28 | 43 | |
| | Expected Count | 13.3 | 29.7 | 43.0 | |
| Essential | Count | 5 | 17 | 22 | |
| | Expected Count | 6.8 | 15.2 | 22.0 | |
| Total | Count | 22 | 49 | 71 | |
| | Expected Count | 22.0 | 49.0 | 71.0 | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. the minimum expected count is 1.86.

Table M 86.
Item: Attend and participate in facilitator trainings and meetings

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.99 | 0.224 | 0.198 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 5 | 18 | 23 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.9 | 15.1 | 23.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 21 | 31 | 52 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.8 | 34.2 | 52.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

Table M 87.
Item: Attend networking/district-level facilitator meetings

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3.746 | 0.154 | 0.222 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 6 | 21 | 27 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.2 | 17.8 | 27.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 19 | 25 | 44 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.1 | 28.9 | 44.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.71.

Table M88.
Item: Collaborate with other facilitators about my own skills and questions

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | Count | 6 | 18 | 24 | 1.456 | 0.228 | 0.139 |
| | Expected Count | 8.3 | 15.7 | 24.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 20 | 31 | 51 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.7 | 33.3 | 51.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 49 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 49.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Table M 89.
Item: Engage in other professional development activities on my own to build my skills as a facilitator

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi | Significance | Cramer's |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | Square | | V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.949 | 0.377 | 0.16 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | 0.7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Important | Count | 8 | 22 | 30 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.3 | 19.7 | 30.0 | | | |
| Essential | Count | 18 | 27 | 45 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 15.4 | 29.6 | 45.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.*2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is .34.


Table M 90.
Item: Complete Level of Implementation (LOI) end-of-year evaluation tasks

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Essential | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Total | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 3.41.


Table M 91.
Item: Review Level of Implementation (LOI) data to inform team goals, planning, etc.

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Essential | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Total | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |


Table M 92.
Item: Use ICAT Tools for data entry and feedback

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | |
| Important | Count | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | |
| Essential | Count | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | |
| Total | Count | | | | | |

Expected Count

Table M 93.
Item: Coach others online

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Essential | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Total | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |

Table M 94.
Item: Develop a support network for facilitators within your district

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Important | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Essential | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |
| Total | Count | | | | | | |
| | Expected Count | | | | | | |

Table M 95.
Item: Having a capacity for relationship-building

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0.087 | 0.957 | 0.034 |
| | Expected Count | 2.1 | 3.9 | 6.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 18 | 33 | 51 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.4 | 33.6 | 51.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 6 | 13 | 19 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 6.5 | 12.5 | 19.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.05.

Table M 96.
Item: Being trustworthy

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 13 | 18 | 31 | 2.093 | 0.351 | 0.166 |
| | Expected Count | 10.6 | 20.4 | 31.0 | | | |
| Somewhat | Count | 9 | 26 | 35 | | | |

| | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| changeable | Expected Count | 12.0 | 23.0 | 35.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 4 | 6 | 10 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 3.4 | 6.6 | 10.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 1 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.42.

Table M 96.
Item: Being able to take another person's perspective

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0.509 | 0.775 | 0.082 |
| | Expected Count | 1.7 | 3.3 | 5.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 15 | 33 | 48 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 16.4 | 31.6 | 48.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 9 | 14 | 23 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.9 | 15.1 | 23.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.71

Table M 97.
Item: Being a reflective practitioner

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.47 | 0.791 | 0.079 |
| | Expected Count | .7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 8 | 13 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.2 | 13.8 | 21.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 17 | 36 | 53 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 18.1 | 34.9 | 53.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .68

Table M 98.
Item: Believe IC can work

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.257 | 0.324 | 0.173 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 8 | 9 | 17 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 5.7 | 11.3 | 17.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 17 | 40 | 57 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 19.0 | 38.0 | 57.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33

Table M 99.
Item: Believe that working hard has more influence on success than

ability

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8.203 | 0.017 | 0.331 |
| | Expected Count | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 15 | 25 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.3 | 26.7 | 40.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 7 | 25 | 32 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 10.7 | 21.3 | 32.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

Two cells (33.3%) have expected counts less than 5.  The minimum expected count is 1. df 2

Table M 100.
Item: Believe that ability has more influence on success than effort

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.224 | 0.329 | 0.172 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | 0.7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 18 | 35 | 53 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 17.7 | 35.3 | 53.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 6 | 15 | 21 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 7.0 | 14.0 | 21.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 25 | 50 | 75 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 25.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33

Table M 101.
Item: Believe that all staff have valuable expertise

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6.087 | 0.048 | 0.283 |
| | Expected Count | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 14 | 20 | 34 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 11.6 | 22.4 | 34.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 10 | 30 | 40 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.7 | 26.3 | 40.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Two cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5.  The minimum expected count is .68. df2

Table M 102.
Item: Believe in the importance of working in a non-evaluative capacity with teachers

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.06 | 0.357 | 0.165 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | 0.7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 9 | 20 | 29 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 9.9 | 19.1 | 29.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 16 | 30 | 46 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Expected Count | 15.7 | 30.3 | 46.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

Table M 103.
Item: Believe that team member's beliefs can be changed

| Rating | | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total | Chi Square | Significance | Cramer's V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not at all changeable | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.085 | 0.13 | 0.232 |
| | Expected Count | .3 | .7 | 1.0 | | | |
| Somewhat changeable | Count | 15 | 21 | 36 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 12.3 | 23.7 | 36.0 | | | |
| Very changeable | Count | 10 | 29 | 39 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 13.3 | 25.7 | 39.0 | | | |
| Total | Count | 26 | 50 | 76 | | | |
| | Expected Count | 26.0 | 50.0 | 76.0 | | | |

*Note.* 2 cells have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .34

**References**

Anthanasiou, M.S., Geil, M., Hazel, C.E. & Copeland, E.P. (2002). A look inside school-based consultation: A qualitative study of the beliefs and practices of school psychologists and teachers. *School Psychology Quarterly, 17 (3)* 258-298.

Arredondo, P., Shealy, C., Neale, M., & Winfrey, L.L. (2004). Consultation and interprofessional collaboration: Modeling for the future. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60,* 787-800.

Beets, M.W., Flay, B.R., Vuchinich, S., Acock, A.C., Li, K., & Alfred, C. (2008) School climate and teachers' beliefs and attitudes associated with implementation of the positive action program: A diffusion of innovations model. *Prevention Science, 9,* 264-275.

Berger, J., Yiu, H.L., Nelson, D., Vaganek, M., Rosenfield, S., Gravois, T., ...Hong, V. (2014). Teacher utilization of instructional consultation teams. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation. 24 (3),* 211-238. doi: 10.1080/10474412.2014.917931

Brown, D. (1993). Training consultants: A call to action. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*, 139-143.

Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for reform. *Ed Leadership, 60 (6*), 40-44.

Burns, M. K., Vanderwood, M. L., & Ruby S. (2005) Evaluating the readiness of pre-referral intervention teams for Use in a problem-solving model. *School Psychology Quarterly. 20(1),* 89-105.

Burkhouse, K.L.S. (2012). Core competencies for effective school consultants. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

DeChurch, LA, Hiller, N.J, Murase, T., Doty, D., & Salas, E. (2010).  Leadership across levels: Levels of leaders and their levels of impact.  *The Leadership Quarterly. 21,* 1069-1085.

Doll, B., Haack, K., Kosse, S., Osterloh, M., & Siemers, E. (2005).  The dilemma of pragmatics: Why schools don't use quality team consultation practices. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 16(3),* 127-155.

Dweck, C.S. (2006). Mindset. New York: Random House.

Emshoff, J.G. (2008).  Researchers, practitioners, and funders: Using the framework to get us on the same page. *American Journal of Community Psychology. 41,* 393-403.

Fixen, D.L., Naoom, S.F., Blasé, K.A., Friedman, R.M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature.* Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.

Frankel, E. (2006). The knowledge, skills, and personal qualities of early childhood resource consultants as agents of change. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 16,* 35-58.

Forman, S.G. (2009).  Innovation implementation: Developing leadership for evidence-based practice. In S. Rosenfield & V. Berninger (Eds.), *Translating science-supported instruction to evidence-based practices: Understanding and applying the implementation process.* (pp. 655-676).  New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Forman, S. G., Fagley, N. S., Chu, B. C., & Walkup, J. T. (2012). Factors influencing school psychologists' 'willingness to implement' evidence-based interventions. *School Mental Health*, *4*(4), 207-218.

Forman, S.G., Fagley, N.S., Dreitlein Steiner, D., & Schneider, K. (2009).  Teaching evidence-based interventions: Perception of Influence on use in professional practice in school psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology. 3 (4)* 226-232.

Forman, S.G., Rosenfield, S.A., Codding, R.S., Gonzales, J.E., Reddy, L.A., Sanetti, L.M.H., Shapiro, E.S., & Stoiber, K.C. (2012). Implementation science and school psychology.  *Report of the APA Division 16 Working Group on Translating Science to Practice.*

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gravois, T. S. (2012). Consultation in schools: A can of worms worth opening. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research. 64,* 83-87.

Gravois, T.A., & Rosenfield, S. (2002). A multidimensional framework for evaluation of instructional consultation teams. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, *19*, 5-29.

Gravois, T.A., & Rosenfield, S. (2006). Impact of instructional consultation teams on the disproportionate referral and placement of minority students in special education. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*, 42-52.

Gravois, T., Rosenfield, S., & Gickling, E. (2002).  *Instructional Consultation Teams Training Manual. Catonsville, MD: ICAT Resources*

Gravois, T.A., Gickling, E.E., & Rosenfield, S. (2007). *IC Teams: Training in instructional consultation, assessment, and teaming. Book 4: IC Team Facilitation.* Catonsville, MD: ICAT Resources.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (2006). *Implementing change: Patterns, principals and potholes* (2nd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Hamilton, M.B. (2009).  *Online survey response rate and times: Background and guidance for industry.*  Retrieved from SuperSurvey, Inc.: http://www.supersurvey.com/papers/supersurvey_white_paper_response_rates.pdf

Heerwegh, D., & Loosveldt, G. (2007). Personalizing e-mail contacts. Its influence on web survey response rate and social desirability response bias. *International Journal Of Public Opinion Research*, *19*(2), 258-268.

Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Dweck, C.S., Lin, D., & Wan, W. (1999). Implicit theories, attributions, and coping: A meaning system approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77 (3),* 588-599.

Hord, S., Stiegelbauer, S., & Hall, G. (1984). How principals work with other change facilitators. *Education and Urban Society, 17*, 89-109.

Huberman, A., & Miles, M. (1984). *Innovation up close*. New York: Plenum Press.

Hylander, I. (2012). Conceptual change through consultee-centered consultation: A theoretical model. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 64,* 29-45.

ICAT Resources. (2015). Retrieved from www.icatresources.com.

Iverson, A.M. (2002). Best practices in problem-solving team structure and process. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV*. Vol. 1 (pp. 657-669). Bethesda, MD: The National Association of School Psychologists.

Jensen, J.M. (2013). *Ten easy ways to increase response rates for your online survey*. Retrieved from Question Pro: http://www.questionpro.com/a/showArticle.do?articleID=deploy01

Kilberg, R.R. & Donohoe, M.D. (2011). Toward a "grand unifying theory" of leadership: Implications for consulting psychology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 63(1),* 6-25.

Klimes-Dougan, B., August, G.J., Lee, C.S., Realmoto, G.M., Blooquist, M.L., Horowitz, J.L., & Eisenberg, T.L. (2009). Practitioner and site characteristics that relate to fidelity of implementation: The early risers prevention program in a going-to-scale intervention trial. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice. 40,* 467-475.

Knotek, S., Sauer-Lee, A., & Lowe-Greenlee, B. (2009). Consultee-centered consultation as a vehicle for knowledge diffusion and utliziation. In S. Rosenfield & V. Berninger (Eds.), *Translating science-supported instruction to evidence-based practices: Understanding and applying the implementation process.* (pp. 233-252). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kovaleski, J.F. (2002). Best practices in pre-referral intervention teams. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.)*, Best practices in school psychology IV*. Vol. 1 (pp. 645-655). Bethesda, MD: The National Association of School Psychologists.

Levine, D.M., Stephan, D.F., & Szabat, K.A. (2013). *Statistics for Manager using MS Excel Global Edition CourseSmart eText, 7/E.* Retrieved from: http://wps.pearsoned.co.uk/wps/media/objects/10721/10978811/Ch_07/levine-smume6_topic_07-06.pdf

McMahon, M.L. (1998). Investigation of the skills involved in the facilitation of Instructional Consultation Teams. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Morgeson, F.P., DeRue, D.S., & Karam, E.P. (2010).  Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and processes.  *Journal of Management. 31 (1) 5-39.*

Neall, T., & Cassata, J. (2009). [IC team facilitator survey December]. Unpublished raw data.

Nelson, D., Aux, K., Neall, M.T., & Gravois, T.A. (2009). Implementation of Instructional Consultation Teams: An analysis of a school-university partnership. In S. Rosenfield & V. Berninger (Eds.), *Translating science-supported instruction to evidence-based practices: Understanding and applying the implementation process.* (pp. 367-384).  New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Rosenfield, S. (2002). Developing instructional consultants: From novice to competent to expert. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 13,* 97-111.

Rosenfield, S. (2014). Best practice in instructional consultation and instructional consultation teams. In A. Thomas & Harrison, P. (Eds.) *Best practices in school*

*psychology V I* (6th ed., pp. 1-16). Bethesda, MD: National Association

of School Psychologists.

Rosenfield, S. & Gravois, T. A. (1996). *Instructional consultation teams:*

*Collaborating for change.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Rosenfield, S. A. & Humphrey, C.F. (2012). Consulting psychology in education:

Challenge and change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research.*

*64 (1)* 1-7.

Saxl, E. R., Lieberman, A., & Miles, M. B. (1987). Help is at hand: New knowledge for

teachers as staff developers. *Journal of Staff Development, 8 (1),* 7-11.

Thomas, G. (2004). A typology of approaches to facilitator education. *Journal of*

*Experiential Education. 27,* 123-140.

Truscott, S.D., Kreskey, D., Bolling, M., Psimas, L., Graybill, E., Albritton, K., &

Schwartz, A. (2012). Creating consultee change: A theory-based approach to

learning and behavior change processes in school-based consultation. *Consulting*

*Psychology Journal: Practice and Research. 64,* 63-82.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works

Clearinghouse. (2013, March). *What Works Clearinghouse: Procedures and*

*Standards Handbook (Version 3.0).* Retrieved from http://whatworks.ed.gov

Vu, P. , Shanahan , K. B., Rosenfield , S.,  Gravois , T., Koehler, J., Kaiser, L.,... Nelson,

D.(2013) Experimental evaluation of instructional consultation teams on teacher

beliefs and practices, *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology,*

*1 (2),* 67-81, DOI: 10.1080/21683603.2013.790774

Welch, M., Brownell, K., & Sheridan, S. (1999). What's the score and game plan on teaming in schools? A review of the literature on team teaching and school-based problem-solving teams. *Remedial and Special Education, 20.* 36-49.

Zacara Interactive (2013). *Cut through a crowded marketplace: 15 ways to increase online survey response rates.* Retrieved from Zacara Interactive: http://www.zarca.com/online-survey-resource/Survey-Best-Practices/Increase-Response-Rates.pdf