



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



December 2004

Table of Contents

Methodology	2
Data Analysis	2
Survey Analysis	5
Appendix A	20
Appendix B	41
Appendix C	43

Prepared by:

A.J. Pappanikou Center
for Excellence in
Developmental Disabilities

263 Farmington Ave.
Farmington, CT 06030
uconnuccdd.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 - Ways Institutions of Higher
Education are Contributing to Well Trained Professionals
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.

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

Institutional Selectivity

Our investigation of the effect institutions of higher education have on the development of qualified professionals in EI/ECSE began with an analysis of institutional selectivity. The rationale for this analysis was that institutional selectivity levels should represent corresponding levels of educational quality. In other words, institutions with high admission criteria should provide students with greater educational offerings which in turn should produce highly qualified professionals. We chose the mean 75th percentile SAT score as a measure of institutional selectivity. We then identified the survey participants whose institutions had this selectivity measure represented in the IPED database (n=650).

The programs yielded an overall mean 75th percentile SAT score of 1177. Programs at relatively more selective institutions included physical therapy (1213), psychology (1209), and education of the hearing impaired (1209). Programs at the lower end of the institutional selectivity spectrum were recreation therapy (1132), special education (1144), and nursing (1154) (see Table 6). An ANOVA was performed and these differences were found to be significant [$F(18, 650) = 2.22, p = .003$]. Not surprisingly, doctorate degrees (1252), and doctoral/research universities (1226) had significantly higher mean 75th percentile SAT scores than associates degree programs (1060), and associates colleges (968) [degree type: $f(5, 645) = 8.47, p = .000$]; Carnegie classification: F

(4, 650) = 36.53, $p = .000$]. Private four-year institutions (1200) appear to be significantly more selective than public four-year institutions (1160.70) [$t(550.66) = -4.80, p = .000$] (see Table 7). There were no significant differences when examining the data by geographic region.

There was no statistical relationship found between institutional selectivity and the percent of students who found jobs in their field ($r = .039$). Furthermore, no association was found between institutional selectivity and the percent of students who found jobs working primarily with special needs children birth to five ($r = .025$). This finding suggests that graduates find jobs in their field and more specifically find jobs working with young children with disabilities at the same rate regardless of how difficult it was to gain admittance to their institution. It also may be that employers' hiring practices are not influenced by how selective an institution is from which a prospective employee graduated. This possible conjecture may be due in part to the fact that employers have relatively more job openings than applicants to fill them.

Table 6. *Institutional Mean 75th Percentile SAT Score by Program (n=650)*

Program	Frequency	Mean Score	SD
Physical Therapy	28	1213	128
Psychology	83	1209	105
Education of Hearing Impaired	8	1209	80
Blended Program	36	1208	102
Nutrition	15	1206	81
Other	29	1202	102
Audiology	2	1200	99
Speech & Language Pathology	43	1199	91
Early Intervention	10	1197	85
Family Therapy	8	1179	91
Education of Visually Impaired	5	1178	87
Occupational Therapy	34	1173	136
Early Childhood Special Education	27	1170	66
Counseling	40	1168	111
Social Work	53	1165	103
Early Childhood Education	70	1158	104
Nursing	73	1154	100
Special Education	61	1144	94
Recreation Therapy	25	1132	90
Total	650	1177	104

Table 7. Institutional Mean 75th Percentile SAT Score by Sub-Group

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean Score	SD
<i>Degree Type</i>			
Doctorate	38	1252	112
Masters	223	1178	101
Undergraduate	263	1165	100
Associates	12	1060	67
Multiple Degrees	94	1190	108
Other	15	1195	63
Total	645	1177	104
<i>Carnegie Classification</i>			
Doctoral Research Universities	271	1226	100
Baccalaureate Colleges	92	1164	107
Specialized Institutions	5	1139	33
Masters Colleges & Universities	278	1137	84
Associates Colleges	4	968	5
Total	650	1177	104
<i>Institutional Control</i>			
Private four-year	277	1200	109
Public four-year	370	1161	96
Total	647	1178	103
<i>Geographic Region</i>			
West	98	1190	87
Midwest	142	1178	103
Northeast	245	1176	111
Southeast	165	1170	102
Total	650	1177	104

Licensure and Certification

One of the primary goals of this survey was to determine the relationship between licensure and higher education programming. Of the 1095 respondents who provided information to this question, 948 (87%) indicated that their program led to licensure or certification (see Table 8). For example, when examining the data by program type, many respondents reported that their

program led to a licensure or certification in high percentages. However, Psychology was an exception with less than one-half of the respondents (50%) stating that their programs did so. A chi-square conducted on program and licensure found that there was a significant difference [$\chi^2 (18, n = 1095) = 225.67, p = .000$]. Further analysis indicated significant differences for all sub-groups (see Table 9). Analyzing the data by degree type indicated significant differences [$\chi^2 (5, n = 1085) = 63.77, p = .000$] with Doctorate programs having the lowest percentage (77%) of respondents stating that their programs led to licensure. Significantly more Public four-year institutions (90%) reported that their programs led to licensure or certification than Private four-year institutions (81%) [$\chi^2 (1, n = 913) = 17.55, p = .000$]. Institutional subgroups based on Carnegie Classification ranged from 75% for Baccalaureate Colleges to 92% for Specialized Institutions [$\chi^2 (4, n = 1095) = 18.49, p = .001$]. In addition, there were significant differences in responses by geographic region [$\chi^2 (3, n = 1095) = 13.96, p = .003$].

Table 8. *Licensure/Certification by Program (n=1095)*

Program	Frequency	Percent
Audiology (n=3)	3	100
Counseling (n=55)	55	100
Early Intervention (n=17)	17	100
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	13	100
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	8	100
Physical Therapy (n=44)	44	100
Occupational Therapy (n=58)	57	98
Nursing (n=254)	246	97
Special Education (n=85)	81	95
Speech & Language Pathology (n=60)	57	95
Early Childhood Special Education (n=39)	37	95
Family Therapy (n=13)	12	92
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	30	91
Social Work (n=65)	53	82
Early Childhood Education (n=125)	99	79
Blended Program (n=45)	37	77
Other Program (n=38)	28	74
Nutrition (n=24)	15	63
Psychology (n=113)	56	50
Total	948	87

Table 9. *Licensure/Certification by Sub-Group*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Percent
<i>Degree Type (n=1085)</i>		
Associates (n=190)	160	84
Undergraduate (n=370)	287	78
Masters (n=311)	296	95
Doctorate (n=52)	40	77
Multiple Degrees (n=129)	124	96
Other (n=33)	32	97
Total	939	87
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1095)</i>		
Doctoral Research Universities (n=341)	300	88
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=395)	350	89
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=126)	94	75
Associates Colleges (n=186)	161	87
Specialized Institutions (n=47)	43	92
Total	948	87
<i>Institutional Control (n=913)</i>		
Public four-year (n=561)	507	90
Private four-year (n=352)	284	81
Total	791	87
<i>Geographic Region (n=1071)</i>		
Northeast (n=341)	284	83
Southeast (n=292)	255	87
Midwest (n=278)	250	90
West (n=160)	140	88
Total	929	87

Licensure and Certification for EI/ECSE

Percentages of respondents reporting that their programs led to licensure or certification related specifically to EI/ECSE were consistently lower than general licensure and certification numbers. Of the 1082 participants responding to this question, 418 (39%) provided an affirmative response. Some unique patterns arose when examining birth to five licensure or certification for

children with special needs by program type (see Table 10). Audiology (100%), early childhood special education (90%), early intervention (82%), speech and language pathology (80%) and occupational therapy (67%) reported large percentages. Family therapy (15%) and nutrition (4%) reported small percentages. Based on results of a chi-square, these differences were significant [$\chi^2 (18, n = 1082) = 197.75, p = .000$]. Graduate programs (Masters: 55%, and doctorate: 46%) were more likely than undergraduate (28%) and associates (23%) programs to offer EI/ECSE licenses or certificates [$\chi^2 (5, n = 1085) = 81.98, p = .000$]. Similarly, doctoral research universities (48%) and masters colleges/universities (42%) had a significantly greater tendency than other types of institutions to have programs that led to licensure and certification for birth to five [$\chi^2 (4, n = 1082) = 48.58, p = .000$]. Nearly one-half (45%) of Public four-year institutions and over one-third (37%) of Private four-year institutions reported having programs that offered licensure or certification for EI/ECSE [$\chi^2 (1, n = 903) = 6.40, p = .011$]. There was not a significant difference when examining the data by geographic region (see Table 11).

Participants were asked to identify the age range(s) for which licensure or certification applied. Of the 1092 participants who responded to the question, 23% (n=246) identified birth to five years, 21% (n=230) identified three to five years, and 17% (n=186) identified birth to three years.

Table 10. *Licensure/Certification for Children with Special Needs Birth to Five by Program (n=1082)*

Program	Frequency	Percent
Audiology (n=3)	3	100
Early Childhood Special Education (n=39)	35	90
Early Intervention (n=17)	14	82
Speech & Language Pathology (n=59)	47	80
Occupational Therapy (n=57)	38	67
Physical Therapy (n=44)	26	59
Blended Program (n=47)	27	58
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	4	50
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	15	46
Other Program (n=38)	16	42
Special Education (n=84)	30	36
Psychology (n=113)	36	32
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	4	31
Counseling (n=54)	14	26
Early Childhood Education (n=121)	31	26
Nursing (n=251)	61	24
Social Work (n=64)	14	22
Family Therapy (n=13)	2	15
Nutrition (n=24)	1	4
Total	418	39

Table 11. *Licensure/Certification for Children with Special Needs Birth to Five by Sub-Group*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Percent
<i>Degree Type (n=1072)</i>		
Associates (n=187)	43	23
Undergraduate (n=364)	100	28
Masters (n=308)	168	55
Doctorate (n=52)	24	46
Multiple Degrees (n=128)	63	49
Other (n=33)	18	55
Total	416	39
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1082)</i>		
Doctoral Research Universities (n=339)	164	48
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=389)	165	42
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=125)	27	22
Associates Colleges (n=182)	43	24
Specialized Institutions (n=47)	19	4
Total	418	39
<i>Institutional Control (n=903)</i>		
Public four-year (n=556)	251	45
Private four-year (n=347)	127	37
Total	378	42
<i>Geographic Region (n=1082)</i>		
Northeast (n=303)	116	38
Southeast (n=267)	105	39
Midwest (n=340)	127	37
West (n=172)	70	41
Total	418	39

When examining the data by subgroups, there were significant differences for program type (see Table 12). Large percentages of respondents from early intervention (47%), education of the visually impaired (38%), and early childhood special education (33%) reported that their programs led to either licensure or certification to work with children aged birth to three years [$\chi^2(18, n = 1092) = 62.58, p = .000$]. Similarly, respondents from Early Childhood Special Education (44%), Early Intervention (41%), and Education of the Visually Impaired (38%) reported that

their programs led to licensure or certification for children ages three to five years [χ^2 (18, $n = 1092$) = 66.98, $p=.000$]. Programs most likely to lead to licensure or certification for children aged birth to five were Early Childhood Special Education (62%), Early Intervention (53%), and Early Childhood Education (41%) [χ^2 (18, $n = 1092$) = 131.17, $p=.000$].

There were also significant differences when examining responses by degree type with percentages ranging from a high of 29% for Masters programs to a low of 14% for Doctorate programs [χ^2 (5, $n = 1082$) = 13.45, $p=.000$]. In addition, significant differences were found for institutional control. One-quarter (26%) of the respondents from Public four-year institutions reported that their programs led to a license/certification to work with children birth to five while only 19% of respondents from Private four-year institutions reported this [χ^2 (1, $n = 911$) = 5.12, $p=.000$] (see Table 13).

Table 12. *Licensure/Certification Specifically for Age Groups by Program (n=1092)*

Program	Birth to Three	Three to Five	Birth to Five
Audiology (n=3)	0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0 (0)
Counseling (n=55)	4 (2)	15 (8)	11 (6)
Early Childhood Education (n=125)	24 (30)	37 (46)	41 (51)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=39)	33 (13)	44(17)	62 (24)
Early Intervention (n=17)	47 (8)	41 (7)	53 (9)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	8 (1)	8 (1)	8 (1)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	38 (3)	38 (3)	13 (1)
Family Therapy (n=13)	15 (2)	23 (3)	15 (2)
Nursing (n=253)	18 (46)	17 (43)	18 (46)
Nutrition (n=24)	4 (1)	4 (1)	4 (1)
Occupational Therapy (n=58)	21 (12)	17 (10)	17 (10)
Physical Therapy (n=44)	23 (10)	21 (9)	21 (9)
Psychology (n=113)	7 (8)	12 (13)	11 (12)
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	6 (2)	6 (2)	6 (2)
Social Work (n=64)	13 (8)	11 (7)	14 (9)
Special Education (n=85)	8 (7)	21 (18)	9 (8)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=60)	27 (16)	30 (18)	37 (22)
Blended Program (n=48)	27 (13)	27 (13)	46 (22)
Other Program (n=37)	11 (4)	30 (11)	30 (11)
Total	17 (186)	21 (230)	23 (246)

Table 13. *Licensure/Certification Specifically for Age Groups by Sub-Group*

Sub-Group	Birth to Three	Three to Five	Birth to Five
<i>Degree Type (n=1082)</i>			
Associates (n=189)	19 (35)	18 (33)	18 (34)
Undergraduate (n=368)	13 (49)	21 (76)	20 (74)
Masters (n=311)	20 (61)	26 (81)	29 (90)
Doctorate (n=52)	14 (7)	14 (7)	14 (7)
Multiple Degrees (n=129)	20 (26)	20 (26)	24 (31)
Other (n=33)	18 (6)	12 (4)	24 (8)
Total	17 (184)	21 (227)	23 (244)
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1092)</i>			
Doctoral Research Universities (n=341)	19 (64)	22 (74)	26 (86)
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=394)	16 (61)	22 (87)	25 (97)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=125)	11 (14)	20 (25)	14 (17)
Associates Colleges (n=185)	21 (39)	20 (37)	20 (37)
Specialized Institutions (n=47)	17 (8)	15 (7)	19 (9)
Total	17 (186)	21 (230)	23 (246)
<i>Institutional Control (n=911)</i>			
Public four-year (n=560)	18 (99)	22 (124)	26 (145)
Private four-year (n=351)	15 (53)	21 (74)	19 (68)
Total	17(152)	22 (198)	23 (213)
<i>Geographic Region (n=1092)</i>			
Northeast (n=306)	16 (48)	22 (68)	22 (66)
Southeast (n=266)	18 (47)	22 (59)	24 (65)
Midwest (n=347)	17 (58)	18 (64)	21 (73)
West (n=173)	19 (33)	23 (39)	24 (42)
Total	17 (186)	21 (230)	23 (246)

Program Alignment with State License or Certification Standards and National Specialty Professional Standards

The alignment of higher education programs with state licensure or certification standards was assessed. Of the 1078 respondents who supplied this information, 921 (85%) indicated that their program was aligned with state licensure or certification standards, and 76 (7%) reported

they were not. The remaining respondents (8%) were unsure of the alignment or reported that alignment was not applicable. When analyzing the data by program type, the vast majority reported high percentages of alignment with state standards with the exceptions being Recreation Therapy (55%), Nutrition (57%), and Psychology (58%) [$\chi^2 (18, n = 997) = 135.12, p = .000$] (see Table 14).

Table 14. *Alignment with State Professional Standards by Program (n=1078)*

Program	Frequency	Percent
Audiology (n=3)	3	100
Family Therapy (n=13)	13	100
Counseling (n=54)	53	98
Speech & Language Pathology (n=58)	58	97
Special Education (n=81)	80	96
Nursing (n=242)	238	96
Early Childhood Special Education (n=38)	35	90
Occupational Therapy (n=53)	50	88
Blended Program (n=46)	42	88
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	7	88
Other Program (n=33)	31	82
Social Work (n=55)	47	73
Psychology (n=97)	65	58
Nutrition (n=16)	13	57
Recreation Therapy (n=24)	18	55
Total	921	85

Chi-square tests were conducted which produced significant differences for each subgroup (see Table 15). Degrees with the greatest amount of alignment were Doctorate (90%), and Masters (90%) [$\chi^2 (5, n = 987) = 27.60, p = .000$]. Public four-year institutions (87%) reported higher percentages of alignment than Private four-year institutions (82%) [$\chi^2 (1, n = 838) = 6.11, p = .013$]. Alignment with state standards based on Carnegie Classification ranged from Baccalaureate Colleges (76%) to Associates Colleges (88%) [$\chi^2 (4, n = 997) = 21.35, p = .000$]. Respondents in the southeastern region of the country reported being aligned with state standards in higher percentages (89.1%) than other parts of the country [$\chi^2 (3, n = 997) = 11.43, p = .010$].

Information about alignment with national specialty professional standards was also obtained. Nearly two-thirds (66%) of those responding (n=1089) noted that their program was aligned with national standards (see Table 16).

Percentages of respondents reporting national alignment was lower for several specific program

types (see Table 17): Nursing (48%), Social Work (49%), Early Childhood Education (50%), and Psychology (51%) [χ^2 (18, $n = 994$) = 146.72, $p = .000$]. Alignment based on degree type ranged from a low of 36% for Associates degrees to a high of 80% for Masters programs [χ^2 (5, $n = 987$) = 128.70, $p = .000$]. More respondents from Public four-year (75%) than Private four-year (65%) institutions reported alignment with national standards [χ^2 (1, $n = 842$) = 8.18, $p = .004$]. Results of an examination of the data based on Carnegie Classification indicated that Doctoral/Research Universities reported higher figures (78%) than Associates Colleges (37%) [χ^2 (4, $n = 994$) = 106.38, $p = .000$]. There was no significant difference when examining the data by geographic region.

Table 15. *Alignment with State Professional Standards by Subgroup (n=997)*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Percent
<i>Degree Type (n=1067)</i>		
Associates (n=181)	158	87
Undergraduate (n=365)	284	78
Masters (n=311)	280	90
Doctorate (n=51)	46	90
Multiple Degrees (n=128)	114	89
Other (n=31)	30	97
Total	912	86
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1078)</i>		
Doctoral Research Universities (n=337)	294	87
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=392)	337	86
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=127)	97	76
Associates Colleges (n=177)	156	88
Specialized Institutions (n=45)	37	82
Total	921	85
<i>Institutional Control (n=905)</i>		
Public four-year (n=559)	484	87
Private four-year (n=346)	285	82
Total	769	85
<i>Geographic Region (n=1078)</i>		
Northeast (n=302)	244	81
Southeast (n=265)	236	89
Midwest (n=341)	291	85
West (n=170)	150	88
Total	921	85

Table 16. *Alignment with National Professional Standards by Program (n=1089)*

Program	Frequency	Percent
Audiology (n=3)	3	100
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=8)	8	100
Occupational Therapy (n=58)	55	95
Early Intervention (n=16)	15	94
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=13)	12	92
Speech & Language Pathology (n=60)	55	92
Recreation Therapy (n=33)	30	91
Nutrition (n=24)	21	88
Physical Therapy (n=44)	38	86
Early Childhood Special Education (n= 41)	32	78
Special Education (n=85)	65	77
Counseling (n=56)	42	75
Blended Program (n=48)	35	73
Family Therapy (n=13)	9	69
Other Program (n=39)	25	64
Psychology (n=113)	58	51
Early Childhood Education (n=122)	61	50
Social Work (n=65)	32	49
Nursing (n=248)	119	48
Total	715	66

Table 17. *Alignment with National Professional Standards by Subgroup (n=997)*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Percent
<i>Degree Type (n=1078)</i>		
Associates (n=183)	66	36
Undergraduate (n=366)	220	60
Masters (n=314)	251	80
Doctorate (n=53)	41	77
Multiple Degrees (n=130)	104	80
Other (n=32)	27	84
Total	709	66
<i>Carnegie Classification (n=1089)</i>		
Doctoral Research Universities (n=342)	268	78
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=398)	281	71
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=124)	67	54
Associates Colleges (n=178)	65	37
Specialized Institutions (n=47)	34	72
Total	715	66
<i>Institutional Control (n=915)</i>		
Public four-year (n=566)	427	75
Private four-year (n=349)	226	65
Total	653	71
<i>Geographic Region (n=1089)</i>		
Northeast (n=303)	204	67
Southeast (n=267)	181	68
Midwest (n=345)	216	63
West (n=174)	114	66
Total	715	66

**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 program 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): _____

2a. Please select the degree obtained by students completing the program described in this survey.

- Associate (2-year)
- Undergraduate
- Masters
- Doctorate

Other (please describe): _____

- 2b. 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
8. Other (please describe):
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"/> Maintain articulation agreements with 2-year programs | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Offer financial support to include students | _____ |

Target Audience

- 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					

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)
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

24a. Is the program accredited?

Yes

By what accrediting agency(ies)? _____

No

24b. 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): _____
- 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					
Families					
Inclusion/ natural environments					
Research and Evaluation					
Team Process					

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:

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 achievement
 - 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
(Including adaptive 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 or 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 program | <input type="checkbox"/> Pediatrics | <input type="checkbox"/> Speech/language pathology |
| <input type="checkbox"/> and the disciplines involved.) _____ | | |
| <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
- Students are placed in practicum settings outside of the program's discipline area (e.g., child care setting)
- Students across disciplines complete field experience together
- The program's steering committee is comprised of individuals from multiple disciplines
- Other (please describe): _____

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	19	2
Alaska	12	4	33	1
Arizona	72	22	31	2
Arkansas	84	15	18	1
California	309	47	15	4
Colorado	80	16	20	1
Connecticut	97	17	18	2
Delaware	19	2	11	0
District of Columbia	42	7	17	1
Florida	166	34	20	3
Georgia	111	26	23	2
Hawaii	28	8	29	1
Idaho	39	10	26	1
Illinois	248	41	17	4
Indiana	164	44	27	4
Iowa	86	17	20	1
Kansas	102	26	25	2
Kentucky	120	26	22	2
Louisiana	86	13	15	1
Maine	30	6	20	1
Maryland	107	27	25	2
Massachusetts	174	28	16	3
Michigan	155	32	21	3
Minnesota	117	16	14	1
Mississippi	61	11	18	1
Missouri	126	19	15	2
Montana	29	4	14	1
Nebraska	64	13	20	1
Nevada	18	4	22	1
New Hampshire	46	8	17	1
New Jersey	107	14	13	1

State	Programs Contacted	Number of Responses	Response Rate	Percent Within Sample
New Mexico	47	4	9	1
New York	457	88	19	8
North Carolina	184	35	19	3
North Dakota	31	15	48	1
Ohio	194	35	18	3
Oklahoma	95	19	20	2
Oregon	53	12	23	1
Pennsylvania	398	79	20	7
Rhode Island	34	10	29	1
South Carolina	108	24	22	2
South Dakota	33	10	30	1
Tennessee	131	27	21	2
Texas	385	79	21	7
Utah	46	17	37	2
Vermont	29	6	21	1
Virginia	132	27	20	2
Washington	85	25	29	2
West Virginia	48	14	29	1
Wisconsin	124	26	20	2
Wyoming	14	5	35	1
Total	5659	1139	20	100

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