



The Center to Inform
Personnel Preparation Policy and Practice
 In Early Intervention & Preschool Education



February 2005

Table of Contents

Methodology	2
Data Analysis	2
Survey Analysis	5
Appendix A	26
Appendix B	50
Appendix C	52
Appendix D	53

Prepared by:

A.J. Papanikou Center
 for Excellence in
 Developmental Disabilities
 Education, Research, & Service
 University of Connecticut
 263 Farmington Avenue, MC6222
 Farmington, CT 06030-6222
 Tel: (860) 679-1500
 Toll-free: (866) 623-1315
 TTY: (860) 679-1502
 Fax: (860) 679-1571
 uconnucedd.org



U.S. Office of Special
 Education Programs

The Center to Inform
 Personnel Preparation Policy
 and Practice in Early
 Intervention and Preschool
 Education is funded through
 grant CDFA #84.325J from
 the Office of Special
 Education Programs, U.S.
 Department of Education

*Opinions expressed herein are
 those of the authors and do not
 necessarily represent the
 position of the U.S. Department
 of Education.*

Data Report

**Study II Data Report: The Higher Education Survey for
 Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education
 Personnel Preparation - Preparing Adequate Numbers
 of Students In Institutions of Higher Education Trained
 in Service Areas Required Under The Individuals with
 Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**

The Center to Inform Personnel Preparation Policy and Practice in Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education (referred to hereafter as the Center) was established in January, 2003 as a five-year project funded by the Office of Special Education Programs. The purpose of this Center is to collect, synthesize and analyze information related to: (a) certification and licensure requirements for personnel working with infants, toddlers, and preschoolers who have special needs and their families, (b) the quality of training programs that prepare these professionals, and (c) the supply and demand of professionals representing all disciplines who provide both ECSE and EI services. Information gathered will be utilized to identify critical gaps in current knowledge and design and conduct a program of research at the national, state, institutional and direct provider level to address these gaps. This program of research and policy formulation will yield information vital to developing policies and practices at all levels of government, including institutions of higher education.

Introduction

The data for this report were collected from the Higher Education Survey for Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education Personnel Preparation (hereafter referred to as the Higher Education Survey) which is a component of the research initiatives of the Center to Inform Personnel Preparation Policy and Practice in Early Intervention and Preschool Education. The preparation of adequate numbers of professionals trained to provide services to young children with disabilities is the focus of this data report. Results were reported for the overall sample and for subgroups, including: program type, degree level, institutional control, Carnegie classification, and geographic region (see Study II Data Report: The Higher Education Survey for Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education Personnel Preparation for a full report of survey findings).

METHODOLOGY

Survey Administration

The Higher Education Survey (see Appendix A) is a 62-item instrument developed through the collaborative efforts of experts in the field of early childhood education services. The survey was designed to be completed primarily online, with phone and paper formats available if chosen by the respondents. The online version of the survey was designed using *Flash*. The data collected were managed and analyzed using Excel and SPSS. The survey was administered exclusively from the University of Connecticut. Staff members were available to provide technical assistance to assure respondents' access to the survey.

Survey Sample

The target population consisted of administrative representatives (e.g. department chairpersons and program coordinators) in higher education programs representing the services required under IDEA. Various educational degree levels and types of institutions in all 50 states were included in the sample.

In an effort to identify potential study participants, searches were conducted of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the Princeton Review, individual school websites and national professional associations. The identified programs represented all services required under IDEA. An electronic file consisting of the contact information for 5,659 potential participants was developed and contained the following fields: program, institution, program administrator, email address, phone number, and address.

Research staff contacted all potential participants via e-mail to explain the purpose of the study, request participation, and provide internet links to access the survey. A second request for participation was sent via e-mail to those persons who did not respond to the initial request or who partially completed the survey. A third recruitment effort was made via phone calls to program administrators who had not yet responded to previous participation requests.

The database consists of 1,139 submissions: 1037 (91%) online, 91 (8%) on paper copies and 11 (1%) by phone. A total of 398 program administrators notified staff of their decision to not participate due to their lack of time, length of survey and misalignment of their program and the intent of the survey.

DATA ANALYSIS

Sample Composition

Survey sections were completed with the following frequency: all 1,139 respondents completed Section 1 (Operational Characteristics of Program); 866 respondents completed Section 2 (Program Characteristics; 794 respondents completed Section 3 (Program Evaluation), and 757 respondents completed Section 4 (Program Completion and Post-graduate Activities). A total of 751 respondents submitted all four sections of the survey. Administrators or faculty members from 1,139 programs submitted at least one section of the survey.

Respondents were given the option to describe their program from choices of 17 specific academic programs, blended program (e.g., focus on early childhood educational and early childhood special education) or 'other.' All of the program options are represented in the data. The sample composition ranged from nearly one-quarter (23%) for nursing programs to less than one percent (0.3%) for audiology (see Table 1).

All 50 states and the District of Columbia are represented in the sample, ranging from 2 programs in Delaware to 88 programs in New York. The overall response rate was 20%. Response rates were calculated with respect to state ranging from New Mexico (9%) to North Dakota (48%) (see Appendix B).

Table 1. *Survey Respondents by Program Affiliation (n=1139)*

Discipline	Frequency	Percent
Audiology	3	0.3
Counseling	56	5
Early Childhood Education	131	12
Early Childhood Special Education	43	4
Early Intervention	17	2
Education of Hearing Impaired	13	1
Education of Visually Impaired	8	1
Family Therapy	14	1
Nursing	260	23
Nutrition	24	2
Occupational Therapy	60	5
Physical Therapy	48	4
Psychology	116	10
Recreation Therapy	34	3
Social Work	69	6
Special Education	87	8
Speech & Language Pathology	63	6
Blended Program	50	4
Other	43	4
Total	1139	100

The sample (100%, n=1139) was comprised primarily of undergraduate (34%), masters (28%) and associate (17%) programs (see Table 2). The majority of respondents who represented associate degree programs were from nursing (74%). Respondents from doctorate programs (5%, n=56) were primarily from two disciplines: psychology (39%) and physical therapy (38%).

Table 2. *Respondents by Degree Type (n=1139)*

Degree Type	Frequency	Percent
Associates	193	17
Undergraduates	384	34
Masters	319	28
Doctorate	56	5
Multiple Degrees	139	12
Other	34	3
Total	1139	100

Approximately half (51%) of the respondents represented public four-year institutions and one-third (33%) represented private not-for-profit four-year institutions (see Table 3). For the purposes of this report, data analysis by institutional control focused on those two groups (i.e., public four-year and private not-for-profit four-year), since they had the largest number of respondents.

Table 3. *Respondents by Institutional Type (n=1139)*

Institutional Type	Frequency	Percent
Public less than two-year	1	0.1
Public four-year	579	51
Public two-year	175	15
Private not-for-profit four-year	373	33
Private not-for-profit two-year	10	1
Private for profit four-year	1	0.1
Total	1139	100

When reviewing respondents' Carnegie Classifications, one-third (36%) were from masters colleges and universities (I and II), and an additional one-third (31%) were from doctoral/ research universities (extensive and intensive) (see Table 4).

Table 4. *Respondents by Carnegie Classification (n=1139)*

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Doctoral/Research Universities	353	31
Masters Colleges and Universities	415	36
Baccalaureate Colleges	131	12
Associates Colleges	191	17
Specialized Institutions	49	4
Total	1139	100

Nearly one-third (31%) of the respondents resided in the Midwest region of the country (see Table 5). Geographic distributions are listed in Appendix C.

Table 5. *Respondents by Geographic Region (n =1139)*

Geographic Region	Frequency	Percent
Northeast	327	29
Southeast	277	24
Midwest	357	31
West	178	16
Total	1139	100

SURVEY ANALYSIS

General Recruitment Efforts

To develop adequate numbers of professionals in the field, the first step is to recruit students into higher education programs. Respondents identified the recruitment practices used to attract students (see Table 6). Overall, respondents most frequently reported disseminating brochures and promotional materials (88%), including information about the program in institution sponsored recruitment activities (83%), and hosting a website (75%). Less than half of the respondents reported exhibiting posters at professional meetings for recruitment purposes (48%), developing relationships with districts or programs serving children and families (46%), and maintaining articulation agreements with two-year programs (40%).

Chi-square tests were conducted to examine if differences existed between the use of recruitment strategies and type of program. There were significant findings for each recruitment strategy. Overall, many program representatives reported hosting a website. However, the percent drops to around one-half for special education (54%), early childhood education (54%), and early childhood special education (56%). The results of a chi-square indicated that differences regarding which programs hosted a website were significant [$\chi^2(18, n = 1110) = 58.31, p = .000$]. An examination of the adjusted standardized residuals was conducted to specify the components that contributed most to the significant chi-square result. The findings show that

early childhood education, special education, and early childhood special education had the highest negative adjusted residuals which support the descriptive analysis (see Appendix D).

In addition, the strategies that were generally used least frequently showed variations when analyzed by program type. For example, less than one-half (46%) of the total number of respondents stated that they developed relationships with districts or programs serving children and families, but several programs reported using this strategy in large percentages [i.e., education of the visually impaired (88%), early intervention (83%), special education (79%), and early childhood special education (74%)]. Similarly, only 48% of all respondents reported that they exhibited posters at professional meetings, but family therapy programs (92%) and occupational therapy programs (70%) employed this recruitment strategy in large percentages. Larger percentages of social work programs (65%) and early childhood education programs (57%) maintained articulation agreements with two-year programs as compared to the overall sample (40%).

Conducting presentations to high school students appears to vary greatest depending on the type of program. Nursing (82%) and occupational therapy (80%) programs were most likely to use this recruitment strategy while graduate programs such as counseling (2%), audiology (0%), and family therapy (0%) reported little, if any, use.

There was also variation among program types when developing relationships with other institutions. Respondents representing education of the visually impaired programs reported the most relationships (88%) and those from early childhood special education programs reported the least (42%).

Based on this examination, the question arises: are there any programs that are more actively engaged in the recruitment process than others? It appears that occupational therapy and education of the visually impaired programs are the most active with a reported average use of seven recruitment strategies (see Appendix D). Conversely, psychology and counseling programs appear to be the least active with a reported average of five recruitment strategies. An ANOVA shows that these differences are significant ($F = 5.642$, $p = .000$).

Some unique patterns emerged when examining recruitment strategies by degree type (see Appendix D). The vast majority of associate degree programs gave presentations at high schools (91%), but only one-third (34%) exhibited posters at professional meetings. Doctoral programs developed relationships with districts or programs serving children and families the least (27%), gave the least presentations at high schools (20%), maintained articulation agreements with two-year programs the least (9%). However, they exhibited posters at professional meetings most frequently (58%). Nearly two-thirds of undergraduate programs (60%) reported articulation agreements with two-year programs. Graduate programs (doctorate: 87%; masters: 83%) reported hosting a website more frequently than undergraduate (66%) and associate degree (66%) programs. Chi-square tests were conducted to examine the use of general recruitment strategies by degree type.

Chi-square tests conducted on general recruitment strategies by institutional control revealed several significant differences. Specifically, programs at private four-year institutions (49%) were more likely than programs at public four-year institutions (41%) to give presentations at

high schools. In addition, greater percentages of programs at public four-year institutions (80%) hosted a website than those at private four-year institutions (70%). Programs at private four-year institutions were also more likely to offer students financial support than public four-year institutions (see Appendix D).

When examining the data by Carnegie classification, doctoral/research universities most frequently reported hosting a website (83%), but reported giving the least presentations at high schools (35%) (see Appendix D). Over one-half (53%) of masters colleges and universities reported having relationships with districts or programs serving children and families. Representatives from undergraduate colleges reported hosting websites the least (58%). The vast majority of associate colleges gave presentations at high schools (90%) and about one-third of these institutions exhibited posters at professional meetings (34%). Specialized institutions (e.g., medical schools and theological seminaries) most frequently reported exhibiting posters at professional meetings (69%), but developed relationships with districts or programs serving children and families the least (31%). Chi-square tests were conducted to examine the use of general recruitment strategies by Carnegie classification.

The use of recruitment strategies in regions of the country appeared to be evenly distributed (see Appendix D). Dissemination of brochures was the only recruitment strategy with a significant difference ($p = .007$).

Targeted Recruitment Strategies

Respondents reported using similar strategies for targeted audiences as they did for the general student population. However, percentages of respondents reporting the use of targeted recruitment efforts were consistently lower than general recruitment efforts (i.e., disseminating brochures and promotional materials (70%), including information about the program in institution sponsored recruitment activities (57%), and hosting a website (53%)) (see Table 6).

Although a large percentage of the overall respondents reported hosting a website for targeted recruitment purposes, only about one-third of Early Childhood Education programs (36%), and Early Childhood Special Education programs (38%) did so (see Appendix D). There is a significant difference among programs when examining their reported relationships with districts and/or programs serving children and families. High percentages of audiology (100%) and education of the visually impaired (86%) programs used this strategy, while physical therapy (11%) and nutrition (13%) programs reported low percentages. Conducting presentations to high school students was reported most frequently for nursing programs (77%) and occupational therapy programs (73%). However, this targeted recruitment strategy was used on a very limited basis, if at all, for counseling (5%), audiology (0%) and family therapy (0%) programs. Chi-square tests were conducted to examine the use of targeted recruitment strategies by program type. Results of these tests are in Appendix D.

Some unique patterns emerged when examining targeted recruitment strategies by degree type (see Appendix D). A relatively large percent of associates degree programs reported giving presentations at high schools (84%), disseminating brochures or promotional materials (83%), including information about the program in institution sponsored recruitment activities and materials (65%), and offering financial support (53%). Not surprisingly, undergraduate

programs maintained articulation agreements with two-year programs most frequently (49%). However, they reported disseminating brochures the least (61%). Masters programs developed relationships with districts or programs serving children and families most frequently (44%), but developed relationships with other institutions least frequently (50%). Doctoral programs were the least frequent degree category to report including information about the program in institution sponsored activities and materials (52%), offering financial support (38%), developing relationships with districts or programs serving children and families (26%), giving presentations at high schools (21%), and maintaining articulation agreements with two-year programs (5%). However, they developed relationships with other institutions most frequently (61%). Graduate programs (Doctorate and Masters) were more likely than Associates and Undergraduate programs to exhibit posters at professional meetings, and to host a website. Chi-square tests were conducted to examine the use of targeted recruitment strategies by degree type. Results of these tests are in Appendix D.

When examining the data by Institutional Carnegie classification, specialized institutions and associates colleges were actively engaged in the recruitment process most frequently (see Appendix D). For example, high percentages of specialized institutions reported including information about their program in institution sponsored recruitment activities (74%), developing relationships with other institutions (72%), hosting a website (64%), and exhibiting posters at professional meetings (46%). Associates colleges were most likely to disseminate brochures (84%), to conduct presentations to high schools students (82%), and to offer financial aid (51%). Doctoral/research universities and undergraduate colleges were least likely to be involved in targeted recruitment practices. Chi-square tests were conducted to examine the use of targeted recruitment strategies by Carnegie classification. Results of these tests are in Appendix D.

The use of targeted recruitment strategies in the four identified geographic regions of the country appear to be evenly distributed (see Appendix D). There was little variation in reported percentages of the targeted recruitment strategies among the regions. In addition, there were no significant differences among responses based on institutional control.

Do the types of targeted recruitment strategies that participants report using influence the percent of minorities enrolled in a program? An analysis of the data examined the relationship between the percent of ethnic minority students enrolled in a program and the type of recruitment strategies participants reported using. There were significant differences based on chi-square results between the proportion of ethnic minorities and the use of developing relationships with other institutions [$\chi^2(4, n = 857) = 11.99, p = .017$], exhibiting posters at professional meetings [$\chi^2(4, n = 857) = 12.90, p = .012$], offering financial aid [$\chi^2(4, n = 857) = 10.76, p = .029$], giving presentations at high schools [$\chi^2(4, n = 857) = 10.89, p = .028$], and hosting a website [$\chi^2(4, n = 857) = 11.30, p = .023$]. Slightly over one-half (54%) of the participants who represent programs where at least one-third of the students are from an ethnic group report giving presentations at high schools. However, programs reporting the fewest number of minority students are not far behind in the use of this strategy. This finding suggests that programs with low percentages of minority students are making an effort at least via high school presentations to attract more minority students to their programs.

Respondents reported that targeted recruitment efforts typically focused on various ethnic groups, high school students (particularly juniors and seniors), and students interested in health care or education related fields, and professionals already practicing in health care or education.

Table 6. *Programs Using General and Targeted Recruitment Strategies*

Recruitment Strategies	General (<i>n</i> =1110)		Targeted (<i>n</i> =891)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Disseminate brochures/promotional materials to prospective students	974	88	625	70
Include information about program in institution sponsored recruitment activities	926	83	511	57
Host program website	827	75	468	53
Develop relationships with other institutions	705	64	455	51
Offer financial support	627	57	413	46
Conduct presentations to high school students	573	52	401	45
Exhibit posters at professional meetings	529	48	309	35
Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families	507	46	348	39
Maintain articulation agreement with 2-year programs	444	40	276	31
Other	188	17	127	14

Level of Success in Recruiting Students from Underrepresented Groups

When asked to indicate how successful their program had been in recruiting students from underrepresented groups, almost two-thirds (61%) of those responding felt they were successful or somewhat successful. About one-third of the respondents (39%) reported being somewhat unsuccessful or unsuccessful in their targeted recruitment efforts (see Table 7). Respondents who reported being successful most frequently disseminated brochures (80%) and least frequently maintained articulation agreements with two-year programs (40%).

Table 7. *Rating of Program's Success in Recruiting Students from Underrepresented Groups (n=1041)*

Success Rating	Frequency	Percent
Unsuccessful	112	11
Somewhat Unsuccessful	291	28
Somewhat Successful	481	46
Successful	157	15
Total	1041	100

Programs reporting the greatest percentages of successful recruitment efforts included: early intervention (82%), social work (77%), counseling (75%), and education of the visually impaired (75%). Few occupational therapy (39%) and recreation therapy (41%) programs perceived their recruitment efforts as successful (see Table 8). The results of an ANOVA indicate that the reported differences are significant ($F = 3.70, p = .000$).

Table 8. *Success Recruiting Underrepresented Groups during the 2003-2004 Academic Year by Program (n=1041)*

Type of Program	Unsuccessful	Somewhat Unsuccessful	Somewhat Successful	Successful
Audiology (n=3)	33 (1)	0 (0)	33 (1)	33 (1)
Counseling (n=52)	4 (2)	21 (11)	58 (30)	17 (9)
Early Childhood Education (n=114)	16 (18)	26 (30)	43 (49)	15 (17)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=39)	23 (9)	28 (11)	46 (18)	3 (1)
Early Intervention (n=17)	6 (1)	12 (2)	35 (6)	47 (8)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	8 (1)	23 (3)	54 (7)	15 (2)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	13 (1)	13 (1)	75 (6)	0 (0)
Family Therapy (n=13)	8 (1)	23 (3)	62 (8)	8 (1)
Nursing (n=240)	7 (17)	25 (60)	48 (116)	20 (47)
Nutrition (n=22)	32 (7)	18 (4)	50 (11)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=56)	18 (10)	43 (24)	29 (16)	11 (6)
Physical Therapy (n=42)	2 (1)	31 (13)	55 (23)	12 (5)
Psychology (n=104)	14 (14)	37 (38)	41 (43)	9 (9)
Recreation Therapy (n=32)	25 (8)	34 (11)	28 (9)	13 (4)
Social Work (n=66)	5 (3)	18 (12)	53 (35)	24 (16)
Special Education (n=82)	10 (8)	29 (24)	46 (38)	15 (12)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=55)	7 (4)	33 (18)	47 (26)	13 (7)
Blended Program (n=46)	4 (2)	35 (16)	48 (21)	15 (7)
Other Program (n=37)	11 (4)	27 (10)	49 (18)	14 (5)
Total	11 (112)	28 (291)	46 (481)	15 (157)

ANOVAs conducted on successful recruitment efforts and degree type, Carnegie classification and geographic region produced significant differences. Associates programs (70%), associates colleges (69%), and the Western region (66%) of the country tended to report success in recruiting students in higher percentages than other degree programs, Carnegie classifications, and regions (see Table 9).

Table 9. *Success Recruiting Underrepresented Groups during the 2003-2004 Academic Year by Sub-Groups*

Sub-Group	Unsuccessful	Somewhat Unsuccessful	Somewhat Successful	Successful
<i>Degree Type (n=1030)</i>				
Associates (n=172)	5 (9)	25 (43)	51 (88)	19 (32)
Undergraduate (n=347)	16 (55)	29 (100)	41 (142)	14 (50)
Masters (n=304)	10 (30)	28 (84)	49 (149)	14 (41)
Doctorate (n=52)	6 (3)	35 (18)	44 (23)	15 (8)
Multiple Degrees (n=122)	8 (10)	26 (32)	48 (58)	18 (22)
Other (n=33)	15 (5)	27 (9)	52 (17)	6 (2)
Total	11 (112)	28 (286)	46 (477)	15 (155)
<i>Institution Code (n=877)</i>				
Public (n=547)	12 (64)	26 (141)	47 (257)	16 (85)
Private (n=330)	12 (40)	33 (108)	42 (139)	13 (43)
Total	12 (104)	28 (249)	45 (396)	15 (128)
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1041)</i>				
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=335)	11 (36)	25 (84)	47 (158)	17 (57)
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=379)	12 (44)	27 (104)	46 (176)	15 (55)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=117)	18 (21)	37 (43)	37 (43)	9 (10)
Associates Colleges (n=168)	4 (7)	27 (46)	51 (86)	17 (29)
Specialized Institutions (n=42)	10 (4)	33 (14)	43 (18)	14 (6)
Total	11 (112)	28 (291)	46 (481)	15 (157)
<i>Region (n=1041)</i>				
Northeast (n=285)	11 (31)	31 (87)	445 (127)	14 (40)
Southeast (n=254)	9 (23)	27 (69)	51 (129)	13 (33)
Midwest (n=335)	13 (45)	27 (91)	46 (154)	13 (45)
West (n=167)	8 (13)	26 (44)	43 (71)	23 (39)
Total	11 (112)	28 (291)	46 (481)	15 (157)

Does reported success in recruiting underrepresented groups actually mean that more minority students are being enrolled into programs? A positive significant relationship ($r = .55$) was found indicating that respondents who reported high levels of success in recruitment tended to be affiliated with programs that enrolled large numbers of minority students (see Table 10).

Table 10. *Rating of Program Success Recruiting Underrepresented Students (n=1005)*

Percent Minority	Unsuccessful	Somewhat Unsuccessful	Somewhat Successful	Successful
0-3.99 (n=173)	30 (52)	44 (77)	23 (39)	3 (5)
4-9.99 (n=196)	14 (28)	46 (91)	36 (71)	3 (6)
10-17.99 (n=215)	10 (22)	30 (65)	54 (116)	6 (12)
18-32.99 (n=215)	3 (6)	18 (38)	64 (137)	16 (34)
33 - Highest (n=206)	2 (3)	7 (15)	45 (92)	47 (96)
Total	11 (111)	29 (286)	45 (455)	15 (153)

Number of Students Admitted and Enrolled

The survey collected information about the number of students admitted to the program and the total program enrollment during the 2003-2004 academic year (see Tables 11 and 12). The majority (72%) of programs admitted less than 60 students per year, with the number of students distributed among the categories: 1-14 (23%), 15-29 (25%), and 30-59 (23%). Admissions figures ranged from zero to 150 or more students. Programs typically reported having more than 60 students (54%) enrolled with the number of students ranging from none to over 350.

Table 11. *Students Admitted to Participating Programs during the 2003-2004 Academic Year (n=1028)*

Number of Students	Frequency	Percent
More than 150	71	7
120-149	27	3
90-119	64	6
60-89	130	13
30-59	236	23
15-29	259	25
1-14	234	23
None	7	1

Table 12. *Students Enrolled in Participating Programs during the 2003-2004 Academic Year (n=1060)*

Number of Students	Frequency	Percent
More than 350	66	6
250-349	51	5
150-249	125	12
100-149	147	14
60-99	181	17
30-59	248	23
1-29	241	23
None	1	0.1

Programs that reported high percentages of large admission rates (60 or more students) included Audiology (66%), and Nursing (65%) (see Table 13). More than one-third of physical therapy (47%), and counseling (38%) programs admitted 30-59 students. Speech and language pathology (40%), blended (36%), and special education (32%) programs were most likely to report admitting 15 to 29 students. Small admission rates (1 to 14 students) were reported by the majority of: education of the hearing impaired (77%), education of the visually impaired (57%), early intervention (56%), recreation therapy (56%), family therapy (54%), and nutrition (50%) programs. There were seven programs that did not admit any new students during the 2003-2004 academic year (early childhood education, occupational therapy (2), psychology, special education, blended, and other). An ANOVA was conducted that revealed significant differences ($F = 20.83, p = .000$).

When examining the data by degree type, it appears that associates programs (62%) had the largest admission rates (60 or more students) (see Table 14). Doctorate programs (36%) had the smallest numbers of students admitted (1 to 14). This trend continues when analyzing the data by Carnegie classification. For example, 63% of associates colleges reported admitting 60 or more students. Public four-year institutions appear to be significantly more likely than private four-year institutions to have large admissions rates. Additional analyses for the individual sub-groups indicated that the reported differences were significant.

There were no significant differences in admissions rates based on results of an ANOVA conducted on geographic region.

As noted, overall 54% of respondents reported enrolling 60 or more students during the 2003-2004 academic year. Programs with high percentages of similar numbers of students enrolled included: nursing (85%), social work (72%), early childhood education (62%), physical therapy (56%), and special education (54%) (see Table 15). Programs that were most likely to enroll 1 to 29 students were education of the visually impaired (63%), family therapy (62%), and early childhood special education (61%). The differences in enrollment patterns by program type were significant ($F = 13.53, p = .000$).

Table 13. *Students Admitted in Participating Programs during 2003-2004 Academic Year by Program (n=1028)*

Type of Program	None	1-14	15-29	30-59	60-89	90-119	120-149	More than 150
Audiology (n=3)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Counseling (n=50)	0.0 (0)	14.0 (7)	34.0 (17)	38.0 (19)	4.0 (2)	6.0 (3)	2.0 (1)	2.0 (1)
Early Childhood Education (n=105)	1.0 (1)	21.0 (22)	22.9 (24)	27.6 (29)	10.5 (11)	5.7 (6)	2.9 (3)	8.6 (9)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=35)	0.0 (0)	48.6 (17)	31.4 (11)	14.3 (5)	5.7 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Early Intervention (n=16)	0.0 (0)	56.3 (9)	18.8 (3)	18.8 (3)	0.0 (0)	6.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	0.0 (0)	76.9 (10)	7.7 (1)	15.4 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	0.0 (0)	57.1 (4)	42.9 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Family Therapy (n=13)	0.0 (0)	53.8 (7)	23.1 (3)	15.4 (2)	7.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Nursing (n=243)	0.0 (0)	3.7 (9)	5.3 (13)	25.9 (63)	27.6 (67)	15.6 (38)	6.2 (15)	15.6 (38)
Nutrition (n=24)	0.0 (0)	50.0 (12)	41.7 (10)	8.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=55)	3.6 (2)	18.2 (10)	47.3 (26)	23.6 (13)	3.6 (2)	1.8 (1)	0.0 (0)	1.8 (1)
Physical Therapy (n=45)	0.0 (0)	6.7 (3)	33.3 (15)	46.7 (21)	4.4 (2)	4.4 (2)	4.4 (2)	0.0 (0)
Psychology (n=107)	0.9 (1)	40.2 (43)	29.9 (32)	14.0 (15)	3.7 (4)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)	6.5 (7)
Recreation Therapy (n=32)	0.0 (0)	56.3 (18)	21.9 (7)	15.6 (5)	6.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Social Work (n=65)	0.0 (0)	15.4 (10)	27.7 (18)	20.0 (13)	15.4 (10)	4.6 (3)	4.6 (3)	12.3 (8)
Special Education (n=85)	1.2 (1)	25.9 (21)	32.1 (26)	16.0 (13)	17.3 (14)	1.2 (1)	1.2 (1)	4.9 (4)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=58)	0.0 (0)	8.6 (5)	39.7 (23)	34.5 (20)	10.3 (6)	1.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	5.2 (3)
Blended Program (n=42)	2.4 (1)	31.0 (13)	35.7 (15)	14.3 (6)	9.5 (4)	7.1 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Other Program (n=3)	2.9 (1)	38.2 (13)	35.3 (12)	14.7 (5)	5.9 (2)	2.9 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	0.7 (7)	22.8 (234)	25.2 (259)	23.0 (236)	12.6 (130)	6.2 (64)	2.6 (27)	6.9 (71)

Table 14. Percent and Frequency of Students Admitted in Participating Programs during 2003-2004 Academic Year

Sub-Group	None	1-14	15-29	30-59	60-89	90-119	120-149	More than 150
<i>Degree Type (n=1017)</i>								
Associates (n=170)	0.6 (1)	5.9 (10)	5.3 (9)	25.9 (44)	31.2 (53)	16.5 (28)	5.3 (9)	9.4 (16)
Undergraduate (n=345)	0.3 (1)	25.5 (88)	26.1 (90)	20.3 (70)	11.6 (40)	5.5 (19)	2.6 (9)	8.1 (28)
Masters (n=292)	1.0 (3)	27.7 (81)	30.5 (89)	26.4 (77)	6.5 (19)	2.4 (7)	1.4 (4)	4.1 (12)
Doctorate (n=53)	0.0 (0)	35.8 (19)	28.3 (15)	26.4 (14)	1.9 (1)	1.9 (1)	3.8 (2)	1.9 (1)
Multiple Degrees (n=125)	1.6 (2)	13.6 (17)	35.2 (44)	19.2 (24)	11.2 (14)	7.2 (9)	2.4 (3)	9.6 (12)
Other (n=32)	0.0 (0)	43.8 (14)	31.3 (10)	15.6 (5)	6.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	3.1 (1)
Total	0.7 (7)	22.5 (229)	25.3 (257)	23.0 (234)	12.7 (129)	6.3 (64)	2.7 (27)	6.9 (70)
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1028)</i>								
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=327)	1.2 (4)	24.5 (80)	32.7 (107)	18.3 (60)	8.3 (27)	4.0 (13)	3.1 (10)	8.0 (26)
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=369)	0.5 (2)	23.8 (88)	26.6 (98)	25.7 (95)	11.7 (43)	4.6 (17)	1.6 (6)	5.4 (20)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=119)	0.8 (1)	35.3 (42)	31.1 (37)	18.5 (22)	7.6 (9)	3.4 (4)	1.7 (2)	1.7 (2)
Associates Colleges (n=166)	0.0 (0)	4.8 (8)	5.4 (9)	27.1 (45)	30.1 (50)	16.9 (28)	5.4 (9)	10.2 (17)
Specialized Institutions (n=47)	0.0 (0)	34.0 (16)	17.0 (8)	29.8 (14)	2.1 (1)	4.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	12.8 (6)
Total	0.7 (7)	22.8 (234)	25.2 (259)	23.0 (236)	12.6 (130)	6.2 (64)	2.6 (27)	6.9 (71)
<i>Region (n=1028)</i>								
Northeast (n=283)	0.4 (1)	22.6 (64)	29.0 (82)	21.6 (61)	11.0 (31)	6.0 (17)	3.2 (9)	6.4 (18)
Southeast (n=255)	0.4 (1)	23.1 (59)	23.5 (60)	23.5 (60)	12.5 (32)	6.3 (16)	2.0 (5)	8.6 (22)
Midwest (n=328)	1.2 (4)	25.0 (82)	22.9 (75)	24.7 (81)	14.0 (46)	4.9 (16)	3.4 (11)	4.0 (13)
West (n=162)	0.6 (1)	17.9 (29)	25.9 (42)	21.0 (34)	13.0 (21)	9.3 (15)	1.2 (2)	11.1 (18)
Total	0.7 (7)	22.8 (234)	25.2 (259)	23.0 (236)	12.6 (130)	6.2 (64)	2.6 (27)	6.9 (71)

Table 15. *Students Enrolled in Participating Programs during 2003-2004 Academic Year by Program (n=1060)*

Type of Program	None	1-29	30-59	60-99	100-149	150-249	250-349	More than 350
Audiology (n=3)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Counseling (n=53)	0.0 (0)	17.0 (9)	32.1 (17)	18.9 (10)	18.9 (10)	5.7 (3)	5.7 (3)	1.9 (1)
Early Childhood Education (n=113)	0.0 (0)	17.7 (20)	20.4 (23)	14.2 (16)	12.4 (14)	16.8 (19)	6.2 (7)	12.4 (14)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=38)	0.0 (0)	60.5 (23)	21.1 (8)	7.9 (3)	5.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	5.3 (2)
Early Intervention (n=17)	0.0 (0)	52.9 (9)	23.5 (4)	11.8 (2)	0.0 (0)	5.9 (1)	5.9 (1)	0.0 (0)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	0.0 (0)	46.2 (6)	46.2 (6)	7.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	0.0 (0)	62.5 (5)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	12.5 (1)	0.0 (0)
Family Therapy (n=13)	0.0 (0)	61.5 (8)	23.1 (3)	7.7 (1)	7.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Nursing (n=244)	0.0 (0)	4.5 (11)	10.7 (26)	19.7 (48)	23.8 (58)	23.8 (58)	9.0 (22)	8.6 (21)
Nutrition (n=24)	0.0 (0)	33.3 (8)	45.8 (11)	12.5 (3)	4.2 (1)	4.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=56)	0.0 (0)	33.9 (19)	37.5 (21)	12.5 (7)	10.7 (6)	3.6 (2)	1.8 (1)	0.0 (0)
Physical Therapy (n=45)	0.0 (0)	17.8 (8)	26.7 (12)	28.9 (13)	17.8 (8)	4.4 (2)	4.4 (2)	0.0 (0)
Psychology (n=114)	0.0 (0)	31.6 (36)	26.3 (30)	15.8 (18)	8.8 (10)	6.1 (7)	1.8 (2)	9.6 (11)
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	0.0 (0)	45.5 (15)	27.3 (9)	18.2 (6)	3.0 (1)	6.1 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Social Work (n=67)	0.0 (0)	11.9 (8)	16.4 (11)	23.9 (16)	10.4 (7)	16.4 (11)	10.4 (7)	10.4 (7)
Special Education (n=81)	0.0 (0)	25.9 (21)	19.8 (16)	25.9 (21)	9.9 (8)	6.2 (5)	2.5 (2)	9.9 (8)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=57)	0.0 (0)	21.1 (12)	43.9 (25)	5.3 (3)	12.3 (7)	15.8 (9)	1.8 (1)	0.0 (0)
Blended Program (n=45)	2.2 (1)	26.7 (12)	28.9 (13)	13.3 (6)	20.0 (9)	4.4 (2)	2.2 (1)	2.2 (1)
Other Program (n=36)	0.0 (0)	27.8 (10)	30.6 (11)	13.9 (5)	13.9 (5)	8.3 (3)	2.8 (1)	2.8 (1)
Total	0.1 (1)	22.7 (241)	23.4 (248)	17.1 (181)	13.9 (147)	11.8 (125)	4.8 (51)	6.2 (66)

As expected, the enrollment rates followed admissions rates for degree type with Associates degree programs (82%) most frequently enrolling 60 or more students for the academic year (see Table 16). Graduate programs (masters: 63%, doctorate: 64%) tended to enroll fewer students (0-59). These differences were significant ($F = 23.88, p = .000$). Based on Carnegie classification, associates colleges (84%) were most likely to enroll 60 or more students and specialized institutions (70%) were least likely (see Appendix D). These differences were significant ($F = 15.72, p = .000$). Public four-year institutions appear to be significantly more likely than Private four-year institutions to have large enrollment rates ($F = 15.89, p = .36$). There was little variation in enrollment patterns when examining the data by geographic region.

Table 16. *Students Enrolled in Participating Programs During 2003-2004 Academic Year*

Sub-Group	None	1-29	30-59	60-99	150-249	250-349	More than 350
<i>Degree Type (n=1017)</i>							
Associates (n=181)	0.0 (0)	6.6 (12)	11.0 (20)	21.5 (39)	20.4 (37)	7.7 (14)	6.6 (12)
Undergraduate (n=355)	0.0 (0)	17.7 (63)	22.3 (79)	19.4 (69)	13.5 (48)	5.9 (21)	8.7 (31)
Masters (n=303)	0.0 (0)	34.3 (104)	28.4 (86)	14.2 (43)	6.9 (21)	3.3 (10)	3.0 (9)
Doctorate (n=53)	0.0 (0)	34.0 (18)	30.2 (16)	20.8 (11)	1.9 (1)	3.8 (2)	1.9 (1)
Multiple Degrees (n=124)	0.8 (1)	20.2 (25)	25.0 (31)	12.1 (15)	12.9 (16)	3.2 (4)	10.5 (13)
Other (n=33)	0.0 (0)	48.5 (16)	33.3 (11)	6.1 (2)	3.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Total	0.1 (1)	22.7 (238)	23.2 (243)	17.1 (179)	11.8 (124)	4.9 (51)	6.3 (66)
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1017)</i>							
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=336)	0.3 (1)	31.8 (107)	26.5 (89)	12.5 (42)	8.3 (28)	5.4 (18)	6.5 (22)
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=382)	0.0 (0)	21.7 (83)	23.6 (90)	18.8 (72)	11.5 (44)	3.4 (13)	7.1 (27)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=118)	0.0 (0)	24.6 (29)	28.0 (33)	18.6 (22)	10.2 (12)	3.4 (4)	1.7 (2)
Associates Colleges (n=176)	0.0 (0)	5.1 (9)	11.4 (20)	21.6 (38)	20.5 (36)	8.5 (15)	6.3 (11)
Specialized Institutions (n=48)	0.0 (0)	27.1 (13)	33.3 (16)	14.6 (7)	10.4 (5)	2.1 (1)	8.3 (4)
Total	0.1 (1)	22.7 (241)	23.4 (248)	17.1 (181)	11.8 (125)	4.8 (51)	6.2 (66)
<i>Region (n=1060)</i>							
Northeast (n=291)	0.0 (0)	22.0 (64)	23.0 (67)	19.2 (56)	9.6 (28)	3.8 (11)	7.9 (23)
Southeast (n=260)	0.4 (1)	20.8 (54)	24.6 (64)	17.3 (45)	12.3 (32)	2.7 (7)	6.5 (17)
Midwest (n=338)	0.0 (0)	24.6 (83)	23.7 (80)	16.3 (55)	11.8 (40)	6.8 (23)	4.1 (14)
West (n=171)	0.0 (0)	23.4 (40)	21.6 (37)	14.6 (25)	14.6 (25)	5.8 (10)	7.0 (12)
Total	0.1 (1)	22.7 (241)	23.4 (248)	17.1 (181)	11.8 (125)	4.8 (51)	6.2 (66)

Program Completion and Post-Graduate Activities

The vast majority (85%) of respondents reported that students who were admitted to their program successfully graduated. When examining the data by subgroups, significant differences were found for program type, degree type, and Carnegie classification. Although the various program types had high mean percents ranging from 77% for nursing to 96% for speech and language pathology, results indicated that the differences were significant ($F = 7.05, p = .000$). Mean percents based on degree type ranged from 73% for associates degree programs to 92% for doctoral degree programs. An ANOVA was conducted which revealed that the differences among degree types were significant ($F = 32.122, p = .000$). Similarly, the differences in mean percent based on institutional Carnegie classification were significant ($F = 34.67, p = .000$) (see Table 17).

Based on information from 712 respondents, the vast majority of students find jobs in their respective fields with an average of 93%. Analysis of subgroups revealed significant differences. For example, when examining the data by program type percentages ranged from 82% for psychology to 100% for audiology ($F = 5.87, p = .000$). Higher percentages of students from doctoral programs (92%) find jobs than students who graduate from associates programs (73%) ($F = 7.06, p = .000$). An ANOVA was conducted which revealed that the differences among respondents based on Carnegie classification were significant ($F = 5.98, p = .000$). Similarly, the differences in mean percent among geographic regions were significant ($F = 3.38, p = .02$) with institutions in the West reporting the highest percentage (95%) (see Table 18).

Table 17. *Students Who Complete the Program*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
<i>Degree Type</i>			
Doctorate	33	92	6
Masters	202	91	8
Undergraduate	234	84	16
Associates	124	73	17
Multiple Degrees	62	89	11
Other	25	91	10
Total	680	85	15
<i>Carnegie Classification</i>			
Doctoral Research Univ	208	91	9
Specialized Institutions	32	88	14
Masters Colleges & Univ	240	86	15
Baccalaureate Colleges	86	84	15
Associates Colleges	120	73	18
Total	686	85	15

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
<i>Program</i>			
Speech & Language Pathology	34	96	5
Audiology	1	95	-
Physical Therapy	34	94	5
Occupational Therapy	33	94	6
Social Work	42	91	10
Education of the Visually Impaired	6	89	7
Family Therapy	5	89	5
Counseling	36	89	9
Early Childhood Special Education	30	88	10
Nutrition	17	88	11
Early Intervention	9	88	11
Recreation Therapy	14	88	8
Education of the Hearing Impaired	7	87	17
Blended Program	30	86	14
Psychology	70	85	13
Special Education	54	85	18
Early Childhood Education	81	84	16
Other Program	20	81	22
Nursing	164	77	17
Total	687	85	15

Table 18. *Students Who Find Jobs in Their Field upon Completion of Program*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
<i>Degree Type</i>			
Doctorate	35	99	2
Associates	134	96	11
Masters	208	94	12
Undergraduate	239	89	20
Multiple Degrees	64	94	16
Other	23	98	4
Total	703	93	15
<i>Carnegie Classification</i>			
Specialized Institutions	33	99	4
Associates Colleges	129	96	11
Doctoral Research Univ	214	94	14
Masters Colleges & Univ	250	92	16
Baccalaureate Colleges	84	88	21
Total	710	93	15
<i>Region</i>			
West	112	95	12
Midwest	226	94	13
Southeast	181	94	16
Northeast	191	90	19
Total	710	93	15
<i>Program</i>			
Audiology	2	100	0
Education of the Visually Impaired	6	99	1
Physical Therapy	34	99	2
Nursing	175	98	9
Family Therapy	5	98	2
Education of the Hearing Impaired	7	98	4
Speech & Language Pathology	35	97	17

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
Early Intervention	9	96	6
Nutrition	17	96	7
Occupational Therapy	34	95	18
Early Childhood Special Education	33	94	8
Blended Program	29	93	11
Special Education	57	93	19
Recreation Therapy	14	91	9
Counseling	37	91	9
Social Work	46	91	10
Other Program	21	90	10
Early Childhood Education	83	86	19
Psychology	68	82	26
Total	712	93	15

On average, respondents (n=612) reported that about one-fifth (21%) of their students find jobs working primarily with children with special needs between the ages of birth and five years after completing the program (see Table 19). A high percent of graduates from early childhood special education (72%) and early intervention (50%) programs work with young children following graduation. Those programs that focus on a lifespan perspective produce overall fewer graduates who eventually work with young children. Almost one-third (30%) of students who graduate from masters programs find jobs working primarily with children with special needs between the ages of birth and five years. In contrast, only 9% of students graduating with an Associate degree subsequently work in the EI/ECSE field. Institutions classified as public four-year institutions and graduate universities (doctoral research universities and master's universities) produced greater numbers of students who later work with special needs children ages birth to five years. Analyses conducted on these subgroups revealed significant differences (see Appendix D).

Table 19. *Programs Reporting Students Who Find Jobs Working With Special Needs Children Birth to Five Years (n=612)*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
<i>Program</i>			
Early Childhood Special Education	30	72	34
Early Intervention	9	50	39
Blended Program	26	46	37
Speech and Language Pathology	34	36	22
Occupational Therapy	30	30	2
Recreation Therapy	14	26	34
Education of the Hearing Impaired	6	22	17
Early Childhood Education	73	17	23
Social Work	34	17	22
Special Education	52	17	27
Psychology	63	13	18
Audiology	2	13	18
Physical Therapy	32	12	14
Education of the Visually Impaired	6	11	8
Nursing	127	8	14
Family Therapy	5	7	10
Counseling	35	5	7
Nutrition	13	2	3
Other Program	21	38	41
Total	612	21	28
<i>Degree Type</i>			
Masters	192	30	34
Undergraduate	203	17	24
Doctorate	33	15	20
Associate	100	9	16
Multiple Degrees	56	21	22
Other	24	23	29
Total	608	20	27

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
<i>Institution</i>			
Public	339	24	30
Private	179	19	25
Total	518	24	29
<i>Carnegie Classification</i>			
Doctoral Research Univ.	193	26	31
Masters Colleges & Univ.	216	23	29
Specialized Institutions	31	21	21
Baccalaureate Colleges	73	12	20
Associates Colleges	99	10	18
Total	612	21	28

**CENTER TO INFORM PERSONNEL PREPARATION POLICY & PRACTICE IN
EARLY INTERVENTION AND PRESCHOOL EDUCATION
HIGHER EDUCATION SURVEY FOR
EARLY INTERVENTION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD
SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL PREPARATION**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of Institution: _____ Date Completed: _____

Name of Person Completing Survey: _____

Title of Person Completing Survey: _____

Respondent Address: _____

Daytime Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Please check the personnel preparation program that will be described in this survey.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Audiology | <input type="checkbox"/> Education of visually impaired | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical therapy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Counseling (Including school and guidance counseling) | <input type="checkbox"/> Family therapy | <input type="checkbox"/> Psychology (Including school psychology and developmental psychology) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early childhood education (Children B-8 without disabilities) | <input type="checkbox"/> Nursing | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation therapy or Adapted physical education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early childhood special education (Children 3-5 with delays or disabilities) | <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrition | <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation counseling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Intervention (Children B-3 with delays, disabilities, or who are at risk) | <input type="checkbox"/> Occupational Therapy | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education of hearing impaired | <input type="checkbox"/> Orientation and mobility | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Blended program (Please describe by providing the definition of blended programs and the disciplines involved.) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Pediatrics | <input type="checkbox"/> Speech/language pathology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) _____ | | |

1. Please check the age ranges that the program addresses.
 - Life span
 - 0-3
 - 3-5
 - 5-8
 - 0-5
 - 0-8
 - 0-21
 - 3-21
 - 5-21
 - Other (please describe):

2. a. Please select the degree obtained by students completing the program described in this survey.
 - Associate (2-year)
 - Undergraduate
 - Masters
 - Doctorate
 - Other (please describe):

2. b. Please select any certificates obtained by students completing the program described in this survey.
(Select all that apply.)
 - Sixth year (education)
 - National certificate
 - State authorized certificate
 - Institution authorized certificate

3. What was the total enrollment of the institution during the 2003-2004 academic year?
_____ students

4. Please check the term below that best describes the system under which the institution operates:

- Semesters (16 weeks)
- Quarters (10 weeks)
- Trimesters (_____ weeks)
- Other (please describe):

5. Please check the boxes that describe your role in this program.

- Program coordinator
- Faculty member in program
- Department chair
- Project director (grant funded or endowed project)
- Other (please describe):

6. How long have you been associated with this program?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-4.9 years
- 5-9.9 years
- 10-14.9 years
- 15-20 years
- Over 20 years

OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM

Admission

7. What are the criteria used to admit students to the program you are describing in this survey? Check all that apply.
- Completion of speech/language assessment
 - GPA (Select minimum GPA required)
 - No Minimum
 - Less than 2.0
 - 2.0-2.4
 - 2.5-2.9
 - 3.0-3.4
 - Higher than 3.5
 - Past experience related to professional program
 - Results of hearing screening test
 - Results of interview with student
 - Review of preadmission portfolio
 - Review of recommendation/reference letters
 - Review of writing sample
 - Scores from standardized tests
 - Minimum ACT score
 - Minimum SAT score
 - Minimum PPST (PRAXIS) reading scores
 - Minimum PPST (PRAXIS) writing scores
 - Minimum PPST (PRAXIS) math scores
 - Other (please describe):
 - Statement of student's professional goals:
 - Other (please describe):

8. Please estimate the percent of students from the following ethnic or racial groups that are currently enrolled in the program (the sum of entries should not exceed 100%):

_____ % American Indian and Alaskan Native

_____ % Asian or Pacific Islander

_____ % Black non-Hispanic

_____ % Hispanic

_____ % White

9. Please estimate the percent of students currently in the program for each of the following demographic characteristics

_____ % female

_____ % part-time

_____ % non-traditional (students 24 years of age and older)

_____ % registered with the university/program as having a disability

_____ % permanent residence is within a 60 mile radius of the institution

_____ % has an emergency credential to teach/practice and are working toward a full credential

_____ % non-resident alien

10. Please describe the GENERAL recruitment strategies that your program uses to recruit students.
Check all that apply.

- Conduct presentations to high school students
- Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families
- Develop relationships with other institutions (e.g., develop a pipeline from one program to another)
- Disseminate brochures or promotional materials that describe the program to prospective students
- Exhibit posters at professional meetings
- Host a website specific to the program

- Include information about the program in institution-sponsored recruitment activities and materials
- Maintain articulation agreements with 2-year programs
- Offer financial support to include students
- Other (please describe):

11. Describe TARGETED recruitment strategies that the program uses to recruit specific groups of students (e.g., students from underrepresented groups; practicing professionals) into the personnel preparation program. Check all that apply and identify the target audience.

- | | Target Audience |
|---|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct presentations to high school students | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Develop relationships with other institutions (e.g., develop a pipeline from one program to another) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disseminate brochures or promotional materials that describe the program to prospective students | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit posters at professional meetings | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Host a website specific to the program | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Include information about the program in institution-sponsored recruitment activities and materials | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Offer financial support to include students | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): | |

12. How successful has the program been in recruiting students from underrepresented groups?

- Unsuccessful
- Somewhat unsuccessful
- Somewhat successful
- Successful

13. How many new students were admitted into the program during the 2003-2004 academic year?
- None
 - 1-14
 - 15-29
 - 30-59
 - 60-89
 - 90-119
 - 120-149
 - More than 150
14. How many students in total were enrolled in the program during the 2003-2004 academic year?
- None
 - 1-29
 - 30-59
 - 60-99
 - 100-149
 - 150-249
 - 250-349
 - More than 350
15. What was the average number of students enrolled in a Lower Division (e.g., Introduction to the Field) personnel preparation course during the 2003-2004 academic year?
- Does not apply
 - None
 - 1-14
 - 15-29
 - 30-59
 - 60-89
 - 90-119
 - 120-149
 - More than 150

16. What was the average number of students enrolled in an Upper Division (e.g., Methods for Working with Young Children) personnel preparation course during the 2003-2004 academic year?

- Does not apply
- None
- 1-14
- 15-29
- 30-59
- 60-89
- 90-119
- 120-149
- More than 150

PROGRAM SUPPORT

17. Please indicate the level of financial support provided by institutional, state, federal, private and other resources for the program activities listed in the chart. Use "A", "B", "C", "D", or "E" as described below to indicate the appropriate level of support. **Every box should contain the most appropriate letter.**

A = Primary source of support

B = Secondary source of support

C = Minimal support

D = No support

E = Not applicable

For state funded colleges/universities, include regular, ongoing state support in the institutional program support column. Only enter special state funding (e.g., contracts, grants) in the state column.

Program Activity	Institutional program support level (include state general funding)	State support level (Other than Institutional)	Federal support level	Private support level	Other support (describe)
Advisory groups					
Clinical supervision					
Community service activities					
Curriculum materials/resources					
Distance education					
Instruction					
Professional development					
Program evaluation					
Recruitment materials					
Student scholarships/stipends					
Other (describe)					

If you identified federal sources for any of the activities described above, please identify these funding sources/agencies:

ALIGNMENT WITH LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

18. Does the program described in this survey lead to either licensure or certification?

- Yes
- No (skip to question 24)

19. Does the program lead to either licensure or certification required to work with children with special needs between the ages of birth and 5 years of age?

- Yes
- No

20. Does the program lead to either licensure or certification required to work specifically with children aged:
- Birth to Three: Yes No
- Three to Five: Yes No
- Birth to Five: Yes No
21. Please check the box that describes the degree level at which students can obtain an initial professional license or certification in your state.
- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Associate (2-year)
- Other (please describe): _____
22. In what year was the licensure or certification associated with the program first approved by the state?
23. In what year did the licensure or certification associated with the program most recently receive state approval?

SPECIALTY PERSONNEL STANDARDS

24. a. Is the program accredited?
- Yes
- By what accrediting agency(ies)?
- No
- b. Is the program pending accreditation?
- Yes
- By what accrediting agency(ies)?
- No
25. Is the program aligned with state license or certification standards for professional preparation?
- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- Not applicable

26. Is the program aligned with national specialty professional standards (e.g., American Occupational Therapy Association, American Physical Therapy Association, American Speech and Hearing Association, Council for Exceptional Children)?

- Yes
- No (skip to question 28)
- Not sure (skip to question 28)
- Not applicable (skip to question 28)

27. Please identify the national specialty professional standards to which the program is aligned.

Place an 'X' in the box that best indicates the degree to which the program is aligned with these standards.

Professional standards	Closely aligned	Somewhat aligned	Loosely aligned	Not at all aligned
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

28. Does the program anticipate any significant organizational changes within the next three years?

- Yes (please describe):

- No
- Not sure

FACULTY

29. How many FTE faculty are in the specific program described in this survey?

30. Indicate the number of core program faculty who are in each of the categories listed below.

(Please enter numeric values only.)

Faculty category	Number of faculty involved in program	Number of faculty who teach about children 0-5	Number of faculty who supervise field based experiences	Number of tenure track positions		Number of non-tenure track positions	Avg. # of courses taught per faculty during 2003-2004
				Tenured	Not yet Tenured		
Full professor							
Associate professor							
Assistant professor							
Clinical/Lecturer							
Visiting/full-time							
Part-time							
Other:							

31. How many additional faculty teach courses in the program? (Numeric value only)

32. Do parents of children with disabilities have a role in the program?

- Yes
- No (skip to question 35)

33. What role do parents of children with disabilities have in the program? (Check all that apply.)

- Teach courses
- Co-teach courses
- Supervise field experience
- Co-supervise field experiences
- Teach one or two course sessions
- Other (please describe):

34. How are parents compensated for their role in the program? *(Check all that apply.)*

- Paid per diem
- Paid salary
- Not paid, volunteer
- Other (please describe):

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Program Goals

35. Please check all of the boxes below that describe the roles for which the program prepares students.

- Administrator
- Direct service provider (i.e., someone who works directly with children and/or families such as a therapist, classroom teacher, or home visitor)
- Evaluator
- Inclusion or community resource consultant
- Parent support consultant
- Paraprofessional/Assistant
- Researcher
- Service coordinator
- Other (please describe):

36. Please check all of the boxes below that describe the settings for which the program prepares students.

- Center-based intervention programs for children with disabilities
- Child care programs
- Clinics
- Community-based programs (playgroups, Gymboree, library)
- Early Head Start/ Head Start
- Home-based intervention programs
- Hospitals
- Inclusive preschool programs
- Schools
- Other (please describe):

COURSE CREDIT ALLOCATION

37. How many academic credits must students complete to finish the program of study (not the degree program)? (Please enter numeric value.)

_____ Academic credits are needed to complete program

38. Of these credit hours, how many are associated with coursework? (Please enter numeric value.)

_____ Credits associated with coursework

39. How many credits are associated with any type of field experience or practicum? (Please enter numeric value.)

_____ Credits associated with field experiences

40. Please list courses offered in the program that have titles and content specific to the areas listed. Then fill in the applicable credit hours and check all age levels covered in the course.

Areas	Course Name (please list all)	Credits	Age level covered (please check all that apply)		
			0-3	3-5	5-8
Assistive technology			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Families			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Inclusion/natural environments			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research and Evaluation			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Team Process			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

41. Please indicate the number of credits within the program that were offered through the following instructional delivery methods during the 2003-2004 academic year.

- _____ Credits offered through on-campus courses
- _____ Credits offered through off-campus courses
- _____ Credits offered through web-supported courses (courses that utilized the world-wide web for delivering part of the course content)
- _____ Credits offered through online courses (courses that utilized the world-wide web for delivering all of the course content)
- _____ Credits offered through instructional television
- _____ Credits offered as part of weekend college
- _____ Credits offered through intensive institutes (e.g., summer institutes)
- _____ Credits offered through correspondence courses
- _____ Other (please describe):

42. How do students in the program learn about the following principles of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education professional practice?

Put an "X" in each box that describes ways in which students learn about these principles and practices. You may check more than one box for each principle.

Principles and Practices	Independent research	Class lecture	In-Class simulations	Field experiences	Other (describe below)
Assessment models	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Assistive technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Child development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Child focused interventions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Cultural and linguistic sensitivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Due process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Family-centered practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Family involvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Individualized Educational Program (IEP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Instructional planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Learning environments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Multi-faceted assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural environments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Professional and ethical practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Teaming process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Zero rejection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

FIELD EXPERIENCES

43. Does the program require mandatory field hours that focus on working with young children with special needs between the ages of birth and five years?
- Yes
 - No (skip to question 45)
 - Not sure (skip to question 45)
 - Not applicable
44. What are the number of clock hours and credit hours associated with mandatory fieldwork related to young children with special needs between the ages of birth and five?
- _____ Clock hours
- _____ Credit hours
45. Does the program offer optional field hours that focus on work with young children with special needs between the ages of birth and five years?
- Yes
 - No
 - Not sure
 - Not applicable
46. Please check all of the boxes below that describe the field experience settings for the program.
- Center-based intervention programs for children with disabilities
 - Child care programs
 - Clinics
 - Community-based programs (playgroups, Gymboree, library)
 - Early Head Start/ Head Start
 - Home-based intervention programs
 - Hospitals
 - Inclusive preschool programs
 - Schools
 - Other (please describe):

47. Institutions use different terminology to describe hands-on clinical application of learning in the field. Using the following distinctions for clinical fieldwork, please describe these field experiences offered as part of the program.

Course Practicum – a component of a credit course that requires students to complete work or make observations in the field.

Practicum – an independent, supervised, practical application of discipline content for credit.

Using the chart below, please describe:

- 1) Name of the field experience (e.g. advanced practicum, field affiliation and student teaching.)
- 2) Number of clock hours spent in this field experience
- 3) Credits received for this field experience
- 4) Term by which fieldwork is typically completed. Define 'term' in the box below.

Please select the academic calendar term your program is based on:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quarter	<input type="checkbox"/> Semester
<input type="checkbox"/> Trimester	<input type="checkbox"/> Years
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	
Please indicate the total number of terms the program consists of:	

(*Please enter a numeric value in the chart's 'term of completion' column. For example, enter '3' if the field experience is completed during the third semester the student is in the program.)

Please complete the chart by putting an 'X' in the boxes that indicate the appropriate field experience, level of requirement, age range of people with whom students work, and the ability status of people with whom students work.

Name of field experience	Number of clock hours	Number of credits	*Term of completion	Type		Requirement		Age Range				Person's Ability Status			
				Course Practicum	Practicum	Required	Optional	0-3	3-5	5-21	Adult	Only disabilities	With & without disabilities	Only without disabilities	
1.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

48. Please check any of the following experiences that provide students with the opportunity to work with/learn about children between birth and five years of age within the program.

- Competency
- Non-credit courses
- Seminars, workshops
- Service learning or other volunteer experiences
- Other (please describe):

49. Please check all of the criteria used to select field sites for any course practicum or independent practicum.

- Accreditation status of program
- Demographic characteristics of students or clients served in field experiences (e.g., race or ethnicity, ability levels)
- Geographic location of program (e.g., urban vs. rural)
- Licensure status of cooperating professionals
- Opportunities for students to work in team settings
- Opportunities for students to work with families
- Program philosophy
- Proximity of program to the institution
- Type of services provided (e.g., classroom-based, clinic, home-based)
- Other (please describe)

50. In general, who selects clinical field sites (course practicum or independent practica) for students? Check one box.

- Faculty
- Student
- Placement Office
- Family Coordinator
- Other (please describe):

51. In the program, who provides supervision to students engaged in practicum? Check all of the boxes that best describes who provides supervision and indicate the average number of clock hours and credit hours per practicum.

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty members | _____ Clock hours | _____ Credit hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical supervisors employed by the institution | _____ Clock hours | _____ Credit hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical supervisors not employed by the institution | _____ Clock hours | _____ Credit hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): | _____ Clock hours | _____ Credit hours |

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION

52. Does the program collaborate with other programs outside of the discipline(s) to offer cross-disciplinary courses or practica for the students?

- Yes
- No (skip to question 55)
- Not sure (skip to question 55)

53. Please check the boxes next to the disciplines or programs with whom you collaborate:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Audiology | <input type="checkbox"/> Education of visually impaired | <input type="checkbox"/> Physical therapy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Counseling (Including school and guidance counseling) | <input type="checkbox"/> Family therapy | <input type="checkbox"/> Psychology (Including school psychology and developmental psychology) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early childhood education (Children B-8 without disabilities) | <input type="checkbox"/> Nursing | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation therapy or Adapted physical education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early childhood special education (Children 3-5 with delays or disabilities) | <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrition | <input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation counseling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Intervention (Children B-3 with delays, disabilities, or who are at risk) | <input type="checkbox"/> Occupational Therapy | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education of hearing impaired | <input type="checkbox"/> Orientation and mobility | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Blended program (Please describe by providing the definition of blended programs and the disciplines involved.) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Pediatrics | <input type="checkbox"/> Speech/language pathology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) _____ | | |

54. Below please find examples of cross-disciplinary features of programs. Please check any that apply to the program.

- Courses are offered and listed jointly across program areas within a college or school
- Courses are offered and listed jointly across program areas across colleges or schools
- Courses are team taught by instructors from different disciplines and/or different programs
- Students enrolled in the program represent different disciplines
- Courses are taken with students from different disciplines
- Practicum experiences are supervised by faculty or personnel outside the disciplinary area of the program

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluation Methods

55. Below please find a list of ways that program faculty may evaluate the quality of their personnel preparation program. Please put a check next to each box that describes a way in which you or your colleagues evaluate the quality of the program.

- Judgments from community constituents
- Performance-based assessment during program (e.g., during field experience)
- Portfolio evaluation
- Results from licensure exams
- Results of employer surveys
- State reports of graduates' induction year
- Structured follow-up interviews or questionnaires with graduates
- Student completion of exit requirements
- Supervisor evaluation during field experience
- Other (please describe):

PROGRAM COMPLETION AND POST-GRADUATE ACTIVITIES

56. How long does it usually take full-time students following the recommended schedule to complete the program? (Please enter numeric value.) _____ years

57. What percent of students admitted to the program finish it? _____ %

58. Does the state require that beginning professionals complete an induction year experience?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

59. Does the institution play a role in the beginning professional's induction year?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

If yes, please describe that role:

60. What percent of students find jobs in their field after completing the program? (Please enter numeric value.)
_____ %

61. What percent of students find jobs working primarily with children with special needs between the ages of birth and 5 years after completing the program? (Please enter numeric value.) _____ %

62. Check the box that best describes where students find jobs after they graduate:

- Most graduates of the program are employed within the assigned geographic region that the institution serves
- Most graduates of the program are employed outside of assigned geographic region that the institution serves

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding your program or the survey in the space below.

Thank you for your time in completing this survey. The information you have shared will provide us with a greater understanding of the higher education programs that prepare people to enter the fields of early intervention and early childhood special education. We sincerely appreciate your thoughtful responses and your contribution to our research efforts.

Please return to:

Amy Novotny

**Center to Inform Personnel Preparation Policy & Practice in Early Intervention
& Preschool Education**

University of Connecticut Health Center

A.J. Pappanikou Center for Developmental Disabilities

263 Farmington Ave-MC 6222

Farmington, CT 06030-6222

If you have any questions/concerns please feel free to contact Amy Novotny at:

(860) 679-1585

anovotny@uchc.edu

Survey Response by State (n=1139)

State	Programs Contacted	Number of Responses	Response Rate	Percent Within Sample
Alabama	132	25	18.94	2.2
Alaska	12	4	33.33	0.4
Arizona	72	22	30.56	1.9
Arkansas	84	15	17.86	1.3
California	309	47	15.21	4.1
Colorado	80	16	20.00	1.4
Connecticut	97	17	17.53	1.5
Delaware	19	2	10.53	0.2
District of Columbia	42	7	16.67	0.6
Florida	166	34	20.48	3.0
Georgia	111	26	23.42	2.3
Hawaii	28	8	28.57	0.7
Idaho	39	10	25.64	0.9
Illinois	248	41	16.53	3.6
Indiana	164	44	26.83	3.9
Iowa	86	17	19.77	1.5
Kansas	102	26	25.49	2.3
Kentucky	120	26	21.67	2.3
Louisiana	86	13	15.12	1.1
Maine	30	6	20.00	0.5
Maryland	107	27	25.23	2.4
Massachusetts	174	28	16.09	2.5
Michigan	155	32	20.65	2.8
Minnesota	117	16	13.68	1.4
Mississippi	61	11	18.03	1.0
Missouri	126	19	15.08	1.7
Montana	29	4	13.79	0.4
Nebraska	64	13	20.31	1.1
Nevada	18	4	22.22	0.4

State	Programs Contacted	Number of Responses	Response Rate	Percent Within Sample
New Hampshire	46	8	17.39	0.7
New Jersey	107	14	13.08	1.2
New Mexico	47	4	8.51	0.4
New York	457	88	19.26	7.7
North Carolina	184	35	19.02	3.1
North Dakota	31	15	48.39	1.3
Ohio	194	35	18.04	3.1
Oklahoma	95	19	20.00	1.7
Oregon	53	12	22.64	1.1
Pennsylvania	398	79	19.85	6.9
Rhode Island	34	10	29.41	0.9
South Carolina	108	24	22.22	2.1
South Dakota	33	10	30.30	0.9
Tennessee	131	27	20.61	2.4
Texas	385	79	20.52	6.9
Utah	46	17	36.96	1.5
Vermont	29	6	20.69	0.5
Virginia	132	27	20.45	2.4
Washington	85	25	29.41	2.2
West Virginia	48	14	29.17	1.2
Wisconsin	124	26	20.97	2.3
Wyoming	14	5	35.71	0.4
Total	5659	1139	20.13	100.0

State Composition of Geographic Region. (n=1139)

Northeast	Southeast	Midwest	West
Connecticut	Alabama	Illinois	Alaska
Delaware	Arkansas	Indiana	Arizona
D.C.	Florida	Iowa	California
Maine	Georgia	Kansas	Colorado
Maryland	Kentucky	Michigan	Hawaii
Massachusetts	Louisiana	Minnesota	Idaho
New Hampshire	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana
New Jersey	North Carolina	Nebraska	Nevada
New York	South Carolina	North Dakota	New Mexico
Ohio	Tennessee	Oklahoma	Oregon
Pennsylvania	Virginia	South Dakota	Utah
Rhode Island	West Virginia	Texas	Washington
Vermont		Wisconsin	Wyoming

General Recruitment Strategies by Program	Conduct Presentations at High Schools		Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families		Develop Relationships with other institutions		Disseminate brochures/ materials		Exhibit posters at professional meetings	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Survey Program (n=1110)										
Audiology (n=3)	0	0.0	2	66.7	2	66.7	3	100.0	2	66.7
Counseling (n=55)	1	1.8	31	56.4	27	49.1	50	90.9	27	49.1
Early Childhood Education (n=126)	78	61.9	77	61.1	76	60.3	102	81.0	40	31.7
Early Childhood Special Education (n=43)	15	34.9	32	74.4	18	41.9	33	76.7	16	37.2
Early Intervention (n=17)	5	29.4	14	82.4	10	58.8	16	94.1	11	64.7
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	6	46.2	7	53.8	8	61.5	12	92.3	6	46.2
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	4	50.0	7	87.5	7	87.5	8	100.0	4	50.0
Family Therapy (n=12)	0	0.0	7	58.3	10	83.3	12	100.0	11	91.7
Nursing (n=255)	210	82.4	74	29.0	180	70.6	240	94.1	126	49.4
Nutrition (n=23)	12	52.2	4	17.4	11	47.8	17	73.9	11	47.8
Occupational Therapy (n=60)	48	80.0	22	36.7	50	83.3	58	96.7	42	70.0
Physical Therapy (n=46)	31	67.4	6	13.0	35	76.1	45	97.8	26	56.5
Psychology (n=114)	30	26.3	26	22.8	55	48.2	89	78.1	38	33.3
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	17	51.5	16	48.5	21	63.6	32	97.0	18	54.5
Social Work (n=68)	25	36.8	33	48.5	47	69.1	64	94.1	36	52.9
Special Education (n=84)	35	41.7	66	78.6	46	54.8	72	85.7	37	44.0
Speech & Language Pathology (n=62)	27	43.5	24	38.7	39	62.9	51	82.3	38	61.3
Blended Program (n=47)	18	38.3	34	72.3	37	78.7	38	80.9	18	38.3
Other Program (n=41)	11	26.8	25	61.0	26	63.4	32	78.0	22	53.7
Total	573	51.6	507	45.7	705	63.5	974	87.7	529	47.7

General Recruitment Strategies by Survey Program	Host a website		Include information in institution sponsored recruitment activities		Maintain articulation agreements with 2-yr programs		Offer financial support		Other	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Survey Program (n=1110)										
Audiology (n=3)	3	100.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0
Counseling (n=55)	48	87.3	41	74.5	1	1.8	24	43.6	11	20.0
Early Childhood Education (n=126)	68	54.0	104	82.5	72	57.1	76	60.3	21	16.7
Early Childhood Special Education (n=43)	24	55.8	36	83.7	16	37.2	19	44.2	6	14.0
Early Intervention (n=17)	11	64.7	16	94.1	2	11.8	12	70.6	2	11.8
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	11	84.6	11	84.6	3	23.1	6	46.2	5	38.5
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	5	62.5	6	75.0	3	37.5	8	100.0	2	25.0
Family Therapy (n=12)	11	91.7	12	100.0	2	16.7	7	58.3	0	0.0
Nursing (n=255)	202	79.2	222	87.1	122	47.8	168	65.9	37	14.5
Nutrition (n=23)	19	82.6	16	69.6	10	43.5	13	56.5	2	8.7
Occupational Therapy (n=60)	56	93.3	57	95.0	30	50.0	28	46.7	15	25.0
Physical Therapy (n=46)	45	97.8	42	91.3	11	23.9	21	45.7	12	26.1
Psychology (n=114)	93	81.6	89	78.1	28	24.6	57	50.0	13	11.4
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	23	69.7	27	81.8	14	42.4	13	39.4	6	18.2
Social Work (n=68)	55	80.9	52	76.5	44	64.7	35	51.5	9	13.2
Special Education (n=84)	45	53.6	73	86.9	35	41.7	48	57.1	17	20.2
Speech & Language Pathology (n=62)	52	83.9	50	80.6	19	30.6	38	61.3	5	8.1
Blended Program (n=47)	30	63.8	36	76.6	19	40.4	32	68.1	14	29.8
Other Program (n=41)	26	63.4	33	80.5	13	31.7	21	51.2	11	26.8
Total	827	74.5	926	83.4	444	40.0	627	56.5	188	16.9

General Recruitment Strategies by Sub-Group	Conduct Presentations at High Schools		Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families		Develop Relationships with other institutions		Disseminate brochures/ materials		Exhibit posters at professional meetings	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Sub-Group										
Degree Type (n=1100)										
Associates (n=189)	171	90.5	74	39.2	128	67.7	173	91.5	65	34.4
Undergraduate (n=376)	210	55.9	167	44.4	226	60.1	325	86.4	164	43.6
Masters (n=314)	93	29.6	167	53.2	198	63.1	278	88.5	174	55.4
Doctorate (n=55)	11	20.0	15	27.3	37	67.3	49	89.1	32	58.2
Multiple Degrees (n=132)	66	50.0	62	47.0	86	65.2	109	82.6	73	55.3
Other (n=34)	18	52.9	18	52.9	25	73.5	31	91.2	19	55.9
Total	569	51.7	503	45.7	700	63.6	965	87.7	527	47.9
Carnegie Classification (n=1110)										
Doctoral Research Universities (n=345)	121	35.1	149	43.2	209	60.6	292	84.6	188	54.5
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=406)	186	45.8	217	53.4	266	65.5	355	87.4	199	49.0
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=127)	65	51.2	51	40.2	71	55.9	112	88.2	46	36.2
Associates Colleges (n=184)	166	90.2	75	40.8	126	68.5	169	91.8	63	34.2
Specialized Institutions (n=48)	35	72.9	15	31.3	33	68.8	46	95.8	33	68.8
Total	573	51.6	507	45.7	705	63.5	974	87.7	529	47.7
Institutional Control (n=930)										
Public four-year (n=569)	232	40.8	280	49.2	360	63.3	488	85.8	279	49.0
Private four-year (n=361)	177	49.0	155	42.9	221	61.2	320	88.6	188	52.1
Total	409	44.0	435	46.8	581	62.5	808	86.9	467	50.2
Geographic Region (n=1110)										
Northeast (n=316)	153	48.4	138	43.7	205	64.9	274	86.7	149	47.2
Southeast (n=270)	148	54.8	122	45.2	168	62.2	242	89.6	132	48.9
Midwest (n=347)	186	53.6	165	47.6	219	63.1	315	90.8	163	47.0
West (n=177)	86	48.6	82	46.3	113	63.8	143	80.8	85	48.0
Total	573	51.6	507	45.7	705	63.5	974	87.7	529	47.7

General Recruitment Strategies by Sub-Group	Host a website		Include information in institution sponsored recruitment activities		Maintain articulation agreements with 2-yr programs		Offer financial support		Other	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Sub-Group										
Degree Type (n=1100)										
Associates (n=189)	125	66.1	163	86.2	67	35.4	119	63.0	31	16.4
Undergraduate (n=376)	249	66.2	316	84.0	224	59.6	198	52.7	61	16.2
Masters (n=314)	261	83.1	261	83.1	71	22.6	159	50.6	63	20.1
Doctorate (n=55)	48	87.3	43	78.2	5	9.1	33	60.0	8	14.5
Multiple Degrees (n=132)	107	81.1	103	78.0	63	47.7	88	66.7	17	12.9
Other (n=34)	29	85.3	32	94.1	12	35.3	23	67.6	6	17.6
Total	819	74.5	918	83.5	442	40.2	620	56.4	186	16.9
Carnegie Classification (n=1110)										
Doctoral Research Universities (n=345)	287	83.2	278	80.6	109	31.6	199	57.7	45	13.0
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=406)	308	75.9	349	86.0	200	49.3	222	54.7	76	18.7
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=127)	74	58.3	99	78.0	57	44.9	60	47.2	18	14.2
Associates Colleges (n=184)	120	65.2	158	85.9	63	34.2	116	63.0	33	17.9
Specialized Institutions (n=48)	38	79.2	42	87.5	15	31.3	30	62.5	16	33.3
Total	827	74.5	926	83.4	444	40.0	627	56.5	188	16.9
Institutional Control (n=930)										
Public four-year (n=569)	456	80.1	463	81.4	236	41.5	298	52.4	94	16.5
Private four-year (n=361)	254	70.4	309	85.6	143	39.6	215	59.6	62	17.2
Total	710	76.3	772	83.0	379	40.8	513	55.2	156	16.8
Geographic Region (n=1110)										
Northeast (n=316)	233	73.7	264	83.5	139	44.0	176	55.7	58	18.4
Southeast (n=270)	198	73.3	230	85.2	98	36.3	145	53.7	40	14.8
Midwest (n=347)	255	73.5	292	84.1	141	40.6	210	60.5	60	17.3
West (n=177)	141	79.7	140	79.1	66	37.3	96	54.2	30	16.9
Total	827	74.5	926	83.4	444	40.0	627	56.5	188	16.9

Targeted Recruitment Strategies by Survey Program	Conduct Presentations at High Schools		Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families		Develop Relationships with other institutions		Disseminate brochures/ materials		Exhibit posters at professional meetings	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Survey Program (n=891)										
Audiology (n=2)	0	0.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	2	100.0
Counseling (n=42)	2	4.8	22	52.4	14	33.3	30	71.4	18	42.9
Early Childhood Education (n=102)	52	51.0	50	49.0	44	43.1	61	59.8	19	18.6
Early Childhood Special Education (n=31)	9	29.0	14	45.2	12	38.7	21	67.7	8	25.8
Early Intervention (n=16)	3	18.8	10	62.5	7	43.8	14	87.5	8	50.0
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=12)	4	33.3	7	58.3	5	41.7	8	66.7	3	25.0
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	3	42.9	6	85.7	5	71.4	7	100.0	3	42.9
Family Therapy (n=12)	0	0.0	7	58.3	10	83.3	11	91.7	9	75.0
Nursing (n=214)	164	76.6	54	25.2	129	60.3	171	79.9	76	35.5
Nutrition (n=16)	7	43.8	2	12.5	7	43.8	10	62.5	7	43.8
Occupational Therapy (n=48)	35	72.9	13	27.1	28	58.3	31	64.6	17	35.4
Physical Therapy (n=35)	18	51.4	4	11.4	22	62.9	23	65.7	10	28.6
Psychology (n=79)	17	21.5	19	24.1	37	46.8	51	64.6	21	26.6
Recreation Therapy (n=25)	6	24.0	11	44.0	12	48.0	18	72.0	10	40.0
Social Work (n=55)	15	27.3	27	49.1	32	58.2	35	63.6	18	32.7
Special Education (n=73)	27	37.0	44	60.3	24	32.9	52	71.2	31	42.5
Speech & Language Pathology (n=45)	14	31.1	13	28.9	23	51.1	30	66.7	24	53.3
Blended Program (n=43)	15	34.9	28	65.1	27	62.8	29	67.4	13	30.2
Other Program (n=34)	10	29.4	15	44.1	16	47.1	21	61.8	12	35.3
Total	401	45.0	348	39.1	455	51.1	625	70.1	309	34.7

Targeted Recruitment Strategies by Survey Program	Host a website		Include information in institution sponsored recruitment activities		Maintain articulation agreements with 2-yr programs		Offer financial support		Other	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Survey Program (n=891)										
Audiology (n=2)	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Counseling (n=42)	27	64.3	18	42.9	0	0.0	14	33.3	8	19.0
Early Childhood Education (n=102)	37	36.3	57	55.9	46	45.1	50	49.0	14	13.7
Early Childhood Special Education (n=31)	12	38.7	19	61.3	8	25.8	11	35.5	5	16.1
Early Intervention (n=16)	7	43.8	11	68.8	1	6.3	9	56.3	2	12.5
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=12)	6	50.0	5	41.7	1	8.3	5	41.7	3	25.0
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	4	57.1	6	85.7	2	28.6	6	85.7	2	28.6
Family Therapy (n=12)	8	66.7	10	83.3	2	16.7	7	58.3	1	8.3
Nursing (n=214)	131	61.2	137	64.0	82	38.3	112	52.3	23	10.7
Nutrition (n=16)	12	75.0	6	37.5	7	43.8	8	50.0	1	6.3
Occupational Therapy (n=48)	25	52.1	27	56.3	20	41.7	19	39.6	6	12.5
Physical Therapy (n=35)	19	54.3	18	51.4	7	20.0	8	22.9	5	14.3
Psychology (n=79)	47	59.5	39	49.4	9	11.4	30	38.0	10	12.7
Recreation Therapy (n=25)	12	48.0	15	60.0	6	24.0	6	24.0	3	12.0
Social Work (n=55)	27	49.1	30	54.5	28	50.9	25	45.5	9	16.4
Special Education (n=73)	31	42.5	43	58.9	26	35.6	40	54.8	10	13.7
Speech & Language Pathology (n=45)	27	60.0	24	53.3	5	11.1	22	48.9	3	6.7
Blended Program (n=43)	19	44.2	25	58.1	18	41.9	25	58.1	12	27.9
Other Program (n=34)	15	44.1	21	61.8	8	23.5	15	44.1	10	29.4
Total	468	52.5	511	57.4	276	31.0	413	46.4	127	14.3

Targeted Recruitment Strategies by Sub-Group	Conduct Presentations at High Schools		Develop relationships with districts or programs serving children and families		Develop Relationships with other institutions		Disseminate brochures/ materials		Exhibit posters at professional meetings	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Degree Type (n=880)										
Associates (n=159)	133	83.6	50	31.4	86	54.1	132	83.0	43	27.0
Undergraduate (n=287)	138	48.1	112	39.0	144	50.2	176	61.3	78	27.2
Masters (n=260)	66	25.4	113	43.5	129	49.6	187	71.9	110	42.3
Doctorate (n=42)	9	21.4	11	26.2	26	61.9	33	78.6	18	42.9
Multiple Degrees (n=103)	38	36.9	45	43.7	50	48.5	72	69.9	46	44.7
Other (n=29)	13	44.8	11	37.9	14	48.3	17	58.6	10	34.5
Total	397	45.1	342	38.9	449	51.0	617	70.1	305	34.7
Carnegie Classification (n=891)										
Doctoral Research Universities (n=285)	81	28.4	108	37.9	135	47.4	189	66.3	116	40.7
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=316)	129	40.8	144	45.6	161	50.9	210	66.5	110	34.8
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=94)	38	40.4	33	35.1	45	47.9	62	66.0	22	23.4
Associates Colleges (n=157)	129	82.2	50	31.8	86	54.8	132	84.1	43	27.4
Specialized Institutions (n=39)	24	61.5	13	33.3	28	71.8	32	82.1	18	46.2
Total	401	45.0	348	39.1	455	51.1	625	70.1	309	34.7
Institutional Control (n=736)										
Public four-year (n=455)	162	35.6	186	40.9	233	51.2	306	67.3	160	35.2
Private four-year (n=281)	109	38.8	112	39.9	136	48.4	187	66.5	104	37.0
Total	271	36.8	298	40.5	369	50.1	493	67.0	264	35.9
Geographic Region (n=891)										
Northeast (n=249)	103	41.4	94	37.8	133	53.4	177	71.1	86	34.5
Southeast (n=214)	102	47.7	80	37.4	105	49.1	152	71.0	74	34.6
Midwest (n=277)	133	48.0	118	42.6	150	54.2	189	68.2	96	34.7
West (n=151)	63	41.7	56	37.1	67	44.4	107	70.9	53	35.1
Total	401	45.0	348	39.1	455	51.1	625	70.1	309	34.7

Targeted Recruitment Strategies by Sub-Group	Host a website		Include information in institution sponsored recruitment activities		Maintain articulation agreements with 2-yr programs		Offer financial support		Other	
	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent
Sub-Group										
Degree Type (n=880)										
Associates (n=159)	80	50.3	103	64.8	42	26.4	84	52.8	15	9.4
Undergraduate (n=287)	127	44.3	152	53.0	140	48.8	125	43.6	49	17.1
Masters (n=260)	155	59.6	147	56.5	48	18.5	112	43.1	42	16.2
Doctorate (n=42)	26	61.9	22	52.4	2	4.8	16	38.1	4	9.5
Multiple Degrees (n=103)	59	57.3	59	57.3	34	33.0	52	50.5	13	12.6
Other (n=29)	14	48.3	18	62.1	7	24.1	17	58.6	3	10.3
Total	461	52.4	501	56.9	273	31.0	406	46.1	126	14.3
Carnegie Classification (n=891)										
Doctoral Research Universities (n=285)	155	54.4	152	53.3	59	20.7	140	49.1	43	15.1
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=316)	168	53.2	179	56.6	132	41.8	141	44.6	50	15.8
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=94)	40	42.6	51	54.3	31	33.0	34	36.2	14	14.9
Associates Colleges (n=157)	80	51.0	100	63.7	40	25.5	80	51.0	15	9.6
Specialized Institutions (n=39)	25	64.1	29	74.4	14	35.9	18	46.2	5	12.8
Total	468	52.5	511	57.4	276	31.0	413	46.4	127	14.3
Institutional Control (n=736)										
Public four-year (n=455)	244	53.6	250	54.9	144	31.6	205	45.1	70	15.4
Private four-year (n=281)	144	51.2	160	56.9	90	32.0	128	45.6	45	16.0
Total	388	52.7	410	55.7	234	31.8	333	45.2	115	15.6
Geographic Region (n=891)										
Northeast (n=249)	131	52.6	156	62.7	84	33.7	122	49.0	42	16.9
Southeast (n=214)	110	51.4	114	53.3	52	24.3	91	42.5	26	12.1
Midwest (n=277)	147	53.1	164	59.2	101	36.5	136	49.1	37	13.4
West (n=151)	80	53.0	77	51.0	39	25.8	64	42.4	22	14.6
Total	468	52.5	511	57.4	276	31.0	413	46.4	127	14.3