



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



October 2007

**Table of Contents**

Methodology	2
Results	3
Appendix A	23
Appendix B	28

**Prepared by:**

A.J. Pappanikou 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 VI Data Report: Training And Technical Assistance  
Survey Of State Part C Coordinators**

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.

**Purpose of the Report**

One of the initiatives of the Center is to conduct research on the training and technical assistance systems for personnel working with infants and toddlers with special needs and their families. Information presented in this report is based on findings of an investigation of Part C training and technical assistance systems. Part C state representative from states and territories were contacted in the Fall of 2006 and Spring of 2007 and asked questions relative to their training and technical assistance programs. The results from the survey are presented in this report. Fifty states and the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands were the target population for this survey of Part C coordinators and representatives. The Part C systems (n=51) were analyzed with a focus on states judged to have a training system (n=20) and states with a technical assistance system (n=12).

Results indicated that activities and organizational structures vary widely across states. Systems tend to be accessible throughout the states and target multiple disciplines. The most commonly offered training topics included: federal regulations and agency specific policies and procedures, transition, inclusion, child and family outcome measurements, and the Child Abuse

Prevention and Treatment Act. The majority of training is provided through workshops and conferences; however, a growing number of states are currently using or developing distance learning methods. Technical assistance is typically delivered via telephone, email or onsite.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants**

Part C coordinators from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands were the targeted population for this survey. To recruit the sample, information about the survey and a request for participation was electronically mailed to coordinators through the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) listserv.

A total of 51 Part C coordinators and/or representatives agreed to participate. These individuals consisted of coordinators from the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD), consultants, and training/educational specialists.

### **Procedure**

Data for the survey were collected through the administration of a semi-structured telephone survey (see Appendix A). Additional information was gathered through web-based searches.

**Web-based Searches.** Websites of Part C programs, Comprehensive Systems of Professional Development (CSPD), the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), and the states' education websites were examined to obtain information pertaining to training and technical assistance. Data gathered via web-based searches provided the researchers with background information. Web-based data was also used to clarify survey responses.

**Telephone Surveys.** Part C coordinators were contacted by telephone, provided with information about the purpose of the study, and asked if they were the most appropriate person to complete the survey.

Respondents were asked to consent to having their responses audio taped for later transcription by the project staff. Duration of the Part C survey ranged from 25 to 75 minutes. For Part C surveys, approximately 13 call attempts or emails were made to contact a participant and complete an interview, with a range of 1 to 62 attempts. In three states, Part C coordinators requested to complete the survey independently via electronic mail (AR, NC, and VT). Follow-up telephone conversations were conducted as needed for clarification.

Following the telephone interview, the transcript of their responses was sent to each respondent for verification. Modifications to the transcript were made by respondents and returned to project staff via email. Qualitative information was coded by question by research staff members.

### **Telephone Survey Instrument**

The Training and Technical Assistance in EI/ECSE survey consists of 27 open ended questions and 4 prompts asking for descriptions of programs pertaining to training needs and/or evaluations. The first section (items 1-14) related to training; the second set of items (15-28) included nearly identical questions to those included in the first section, but pertained to the technical assistance

system. The last three items were global and pertained to the general state system. This survey was administered as a semi-structured interview to allow respondents to engage in a dialogue with project staff and to clarify information and answer participant's questions.

### **Fidelity Procedures**

Web-based. To ensure reliability and consistency among project staff gathering the web-based information, a written protocol was designed to detail the procedures for collecting web-based information and recording supporting documents.

Telephone Survey. Research staff members were trained on data collection procedures using a written protocol for obtaining consent and administering the survey. Interviewers piloted the survey with professionals in the field of EI/ECSE who were not part of the sample. The pilot group and project staff observing the administration of the telephone survey gave feedback.

Weekly meetings were held to discuss issues and address questions raised during the survey administration. Project staff reviewed each audiotape and provided feedback to the interviewers. Research staff examined all telephone survey tapes to ensure the accuracy of data entry and interpretation. Inter-rater reliability measures for more than 25% of the Part C states resulted in an overall agreement of 94%. Both raters met and came to a consensus on the items that were disagreed upon resulting in 100% agreement.

### **Data Analysis**

Research staff analyzed the qualitative responses to identify salient themes and to categorize data related to topics that emerged from the responses. Each response was then coded based on the themes.

## **RESULTS**

Prior to this study, the status of state level training and technical assistance systems for early intervention providers had not been systematically examined. The purpose of Study VI: Training and Technical Assistance Systems in EI/ECSE is to identify and evaluate the current personnel preparation systems for early intervention/preschool education professionals in each state. Systems that provide and maintain effective and comprehensive personnel preparation and development may serve as models for national standards.

### **Training and Technical Assistance for Part C Providers**

Coordinators of Part C programs from the 50 states, District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands were contacted. All states except South Dakota participated in the study resulting in 51 completed interviews (n=51); a response rate of 98%.

Twenty-six Part C coordinators and nine CSPD coordinators individually completed the survey. The remaining sixteen surveys were completed by multiple respondents such as Part C coordinators, CSPD coordinators, training directors, professional development directors, and staff from contracted training agencies who worked directly with the Part C or CSPD coordinators (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Job Titles of Participants Who Completed Survey (n=51)*

Survey Respondent	N	%
Part C Coordinator Only	26	51
Other Part C Staff <sup>a</sup>	12	24
Cspd Coordinator Only	9	18
Part C Coordinator And Other Part C Staff	2	4
Cspd Coordinator And Other Part C Staff	1	2
Part C Coordinator And Cspd Coordinator	1	2
Total	51	100

<sup>a</sup> Other staff included training directors, professional development directors, and staff from contracted training agencies who worked directly with the Part C or CSPD coordinators.

### Definition of a Training System

State training systems were defined as state systems that contained each of ten components that demonstrated a systematic, sustainable approach to professional development. Defining components included: (a) dedicated resources such as an agency budget line-item; (b) staffing; (c) a dedicated agency responsible for the provision of the training; (d) policies or procedures for determining professional development expectations; (e) training content; (f) quality assurance systems; (g) process for identifying and measuring outcomes; (h) on-going, needs based professional development that is provided over-time; (i) a structure for the delivery of content (training modules, etc.), and (j) work-place applicability.

The definitions used to classify systems of training and technical assistance were team generated and influenced by the work of Winton, McCollum, and Catlett (1997). The research team used the worksheet provided in Table 2 to determine if states had a training system as defined above. Using this process, the researchers concluded that although 39 Part C representatives (76%) considered their state to have a training system, only 20 (39%) of the states had a training system in which all of the components delineated above were met. See Table 4 for the list of states that have Part C training systems that met the entire definition.

A state was determined to have a training system if they met the following ten components of our definition. Technical assistance information found throughout the entire transcript was used to determine if the system met each required component. The key below indicates the general area, or question number, in which the information may be found on the survey.

Table 2. *Training System Worksheet*

Definition Components for Training Systems	Survey Item
A. Dedicated resources such as an agency budget line-item	1
B. Staffing	2-3
C. A dedicated agency(s) responsible for the provision of the training	1
D. Policies and procedures for determining professional development expectations	5-6
E. Has training content	9
F. Quality assurance	10-12
G. Identifying and measures outcomes	10-11
H. Provides on-going, needs-based professional development that is provided over-time	4
I. A structure for the delivery of content (training modules, etc.)	4
J. Has work-place applicability	2-14

### Definition of a Technical Assistance System

Of the 51 respondents, 43 (84%) indicated that they had a technical assistance system. Information gleaned from interviews with state coordinators pertaining to their technical assistance systems was used against the following definition: (a) dedicated resources such as an agency budget line-item; (b) staffing; (c) a dedicated agency responsible for the provision of the training; (d) policies or procedures for determining professional development expectations; (e) training content; (f) quality assurance systems; (g) process for identifying and measuring outcomes; (h) work-place applicability; (i) provides ongoing TA; (j) individualized professional development; (k) problem solving services, and (l) assists individuals, programs and agencies in improving their services, management, policies, or outcomes. Table 3 contains the worksheet used to determine if states had a technical assistance system. Based on these definition components, 12 states (23%) had a technical assistance system where all the above-mentioned components were met (see Table 4).

A state was determined to have a technical assistance system if they met the following components of our definition. Technical assistance information found throughout the entire transcript was used to determine if the system met each required component. The key below indicates the general area, or question number, in which the information may be found on the survey.

Table 3. *Technical Assistance System Worksheet*

Definition Components for Technical Assistance Systems	Survey Item
A. Dedicated resources such as an agency budget line-item	15
B. Staffing	16-17
C. A dedicated agency(s) responsible for the provision of the training	15
D. Policies and procedures for determining professional development expectations	19-20
E. Has training content	23
F. Quality assurance	24-26
G. Has a process to identify and measure outcomes	24-25
H. Has work-place applicability	15-28
I. Provides ongoing TA	18
J. Has individualized professional development	16;18
K. Has problem-solving services	16-28
L. Assists individuals, program, and agencies in improving their services or management or policies or outcomes	16-28

Table 4. *States with a Training System and/or a Technical Assistance System (n=51)*

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

#### States without a Part C Training System

States missing one or more of the definition components were not considered to have a training system for Part C personnel (n=31). Table 5 indicates which definitional components the 31 states/territories were determined to have or not have.

Table 5. States without a Training System (n=31)

State	Dedicated Resources	Staffing	Dedicated Agency	Policies to Determine Professional Development Needs	Content of Training	Quality Assurance	Process to Identify and Measure Outcomes	On-going, Needs Based, Over-time	Structure for Delivery	Work-place Applicability
AK	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
CT	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
DE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
DC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
FL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
GA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
HI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
ID	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
IN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
IA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
KY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
LA	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
ME	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
MA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
MO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
J	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
NM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
NY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
ND	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
OK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
OR	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
SC	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
TN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
UT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
VT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
VI	N/A	N	N	N/A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
VA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
WA	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WY	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y



### States with a Training System for Part C Personnel

The following information was gathered from states with a training system (n=20) according to the definition provided. Appendix B includes the survey, the frequency of responses, and responses by state.

**Funding.** Most frequently, state coordinators indicated that federal funds were used for Part C training (see Table 6).

Table 6. *Funding of Training Systems (n=20)*

Funding Source for Training	Frequency
Federal	18
State	10
Medicaid	3
Family fees	1

**Participants.** All respondents from states with a training system (n=20) indicated that early intervention providers attended trainings (see Table 7).

Table 7. *Participants in Training (n=20)*

Participants in Training	Frequency
Early intervention providers	20
Other early childhood personnel	12
Families	8
Service coordinators	6
University faculty	2

**Providers of Training.** All twenty of the states with a training system used in-state experts or consultants to provide trainings (see Table 8).

Table 8. *Providers of the Trainings (n=20)*

Providers of the Training	Frequency
Instate expert/consultant	20
Out of state expert	5
Service provider	3
Online training	1
National resource (e.g., NECTAC, ECO)	1
Parents	1

**Delivery of Training.** Most frequently, workshops (classroom, lecture, or small group format) were used to deliver training content to Part C personnel (see Table 9).

Table 9. *Delivery of Training (n=20)*

Methods of Training	Frequency
Workshops	19
Distance/web-based learning	16
Lecture/presentation	9
Conferences	8
Mentoring/coaching	1
DVDs/videos	1
Collaboration/training	1

**Required Training Specific to Part C Personnel.** Fifteen of the twenty states indicated that they had required trainings. Five states indicated that there was no required training (CA, KS, MD, MI, and PA) (see Table 10).

Table 10. *Required Training Specific to Part C (n=20)*

Required Training Specific to Part C	Frequency
Yes	15
No	5

**Training Linked to Certification, Credits and/or Other.** Most frequently, training was linked to Continuing Education Units (CEUs), Continuing Education Credits (CECs), or early intervention points or units (see Table 11).

Table 11. *Training Linked to Certification, Credits and/or Other (n=20)*

Training linked to Certification, Credits and/or Other	Frequency
CEUs/CECs/early intervention points/units	15
Credential	5
Other	5
Certification	2

**Supports Provided to Attend Training.** Each state with a training system used supports or incentives to encourage participation in professional development (see Table 12).

Table 12. *Supports or Incentives Provided to Attend Training (n=20)*

Supports or Incentives Provided to Attend Training	Frequency
Paid time	10
Free training	9
CEUs offered	8
Other: meets training requirements, intrinsic reward, networking, etc.	8
Reimbursed for travel expenses	6
Stipend/scholarship provided to trainee	4
Decided only at the local level	1

**Identifying Training Needs.** All twenty states had a process in place for identifying training needs (see Table 13).

Table 13. *Identification of Training Needs*

Identification of Training Needs	Frequency
Provider/administrator/TA consultant input (surveys, training needs interview, self-assessments)	18
Personnel Preparation Training Committee (may include supervisors, parents, providers, stakeholders, etc.)	12
Compliance/performance/monitoring	12
Evidence-based/best practice/research	11
Federal and/or state initiatives	7
State credential/competencies	6

**Training Content.** Many different areas of training content were cited, with the most common being training content on service delivery, policies and procedures, working with families, and disability information (see Table 14). When asked specifically about training related to early language and literacy, eight states indicated that they had training in this area.

Table 14. *Training Content (n=20)*

Training Content	Frequency
Service delivery	19
Policies and procedures	18
Working with families	11
Disability information	10
Child development	7
Early childhood risk factors	3
Data management/outcomes	3

**Evaluation of Training.** Of the twenty states that had a training system all had a method to evaluate the training opportunities that took place. The majority of states used trainee evaluation or survey forms (see Table 15).

Table 15. *Evaluation of Training (n=20)*

Evaluation of Training	Frequency
Trainee evaluation/survey forms	18
Compliance/monitoring/outcome data used	5
Verbal feedback	3
Trainee exams	3

**Quality Assurance.** The quality assurance and/or longer term impact of training on practice was evaluated by most states (70%) through monitoring (see Table 16).

Table 16. *Quality Assurance (n=20)*

Quality Assurance	Frequency
Monitoring	14
Survey/evaluation	7
Using feedback mechanism	4
Observe training	1

**On-going Professional Development of those who Provide the Training.** Five states indicated that there were no procedures in place for on-going professional development or retooling for those who provide the training. Of the other 15 states, 6 included informational meetings such as monthly or regional meetings were used to retool trainers. Six states representatives reported that providers of training stay current through written materials, such as reading journals, listserv information or using NECTAC materials (see Table 17).

Table 17. *Ongoing Professional Development (n=20)*

Ongoing Professional Development	Frequency
Informational meetings (regional meetings/monthly meetings of trainers)	6
Written materials (listserv/journals/ NECTAC information)	6
Conferences	5
National organizations (webcasts/resource centers)	5
No procedures in place	5
Training support (Train the Trainer)	4
Yes: unspecified type	1

**Training Across Disciplines.** Thirteen of the states reported no differences in the trainings across different disciplines. Seven states responded that they had offered some discipline specific trainings (see Table 18). For example, Arkansas has a specific course in developmental therapy (for developmental therapists) and a course in therapeutic services orientation (for other specialists). In Ohio, different providers are required to take different combinations of workshops. For example, newborn home visiting nurses take a workshop in postpartum assessment, but do not complete an infant/toddler development course, which is taken by other providers. Several states indicated additional or separate workshops for service coordinators (WI, OH, AR).

Table 18. *Training Across Disciplines (n=20)*

Training Across Disciplines	Frequency
No differences across disciplines	13
Have discipline specific trainings (at least sometimes)	7

**Networking.** All 20 states with a training system relied on some degree of networking with other agencies to provide training (see Table 19).

Table 19. *List of Agencies/Organizations Used for Networking (n=20)*

List of Agencies/Organizations Used for Networking	Frequency
Other State Agencies: Interagency Coordinating Councils/State T&TA Committees/ Early Childhood Training Collaborative (Department of Health; Medical Quality Assurance Licensing Board; Child Protective Services; Healthy Families; Department of Health and Human Services; Department of Mental Health; Office of Child Care; Foster Care; Drug & Alcohol Office; Department of Mental Retardation; Department of Social Services; Medicaid; HeadStart & Child Care)	17
Universities (Higher Education)	11
OSEP/Department of Education	6
Parent Groups/Parent Training Institutes	5
Contracted Training & TA Agencies/Provider Agencies	5
Professional Therapy Organizations	4
Childcare Resource & Referral Agencies/Special Education Resource Center	4
Disability Organizations/Advocacy Associations (UCEDD, Easter Seals, Autism Programs, Sensory Disabilities Project, Schools for the Deaf & Blind Association for the Education of Young Children; Association for Special Education; Nemours Children Foundation)	4
National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center	2
Other State Part C Offices & Programs (share documents)	1

***States without a Part C Technical Assistance System***

Those states that did not fit the definition of having a technical assistance system (n=39) are listed in Table 20 along with what part of the criteria they did and did not meet.

Table 20. States without a Part C Technical Assistance System (n=39)

State	Dedicated Resources	Staffing	Dedicated Agency	Policies to Determine Professional Development Needs	Content of Training	Quality Assurance	Identifying and Measuring Outcomes	Work-place Applicability	On-going TA	Individualized Professional Development	Problem-solving Services	Assist Individuals, Management, Policies or Outcomes
Alabama	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alaska	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arizona	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arkansas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Colorado	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Delaware	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hawaii	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Idaho	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Illinois	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Iowa	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Kentucky	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Louisiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maine	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Massachusetts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Table 20. States without a Part C Technical Assistance System (n=39)

State	Dedicated Resources	Staffing	Dedicated Agency	Policies to Determine Professional Development Needs	Content of Training	Quality Assurance	Identifying and Measuring Outcomes	Work-place Applicability	On-going TA	Individualized Professional Development	Problem-solving Services	Assist Individuals, Management, Policies or Outcomes
Mississippi	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Missouri	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Montana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Mexico	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
North Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Oregon	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Carolina	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vermont	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Virgin Islands	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wyoming	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y



### States with a Technical Assistance System (n=12)

There were 12 states that met the definition of a technical assistance system.

**Funding.** Funding for the training systems was primarily provided by federal and state funds. Most of the states responded that their TA is funded with both federal and state funds. One state, Ohio, mentioned that Medicaid partially funded TA (see Table 21).

Table 21. *Funding of Technical Assistance Systems (n=12)*

Funding of Technical Assistance Systems	Frequency
Federal	9
State	9
Medicaid	1

**Participants.** All twelve of the states with a TA system reported that early intervention providers participated in TA (see Table 22).

Table 22. *Participants in Technical Assistance (n=12)*

Participants in technical assistance	Frequency
Early intervention providers	12
Other early childhood/school-age personnel	4
Families	2
Service coordinators	1

**Providers of Technical Assistance.** All twelve state representatives reported that an in-state expert or a consultant provided the TA, while one of those also mentioned that direct providers also provided the TA (see Table 23).

Table 23. *Providers of Technical Assistance (n=12)*

Providers of Technical Assistance	Frequency
Instate expert/consultant	12
Direct providers	1

**Technical Assistance Delivery Methods.** Part C personnel in all 12 states with TA systems received TA through workshops or classroom/lecture setting (see Table 24).

Table 24. *Technical Assistance Methods (n=12)*

Technical Assistance Methods	Frequency
Workshops (e.g., classroom/lecture, small group/onsite/in person/face to face)	12
Phone calls/emails based on individual requests	8
Distance learning	3
Annual meeting/symposium/conference	1
Written material (e.g., memos/listserv)	1
Regular staff meetings	1

**Training Linked to Certification, Credits or Other.** Technical assistance in six of the states was not connected to any form of certification. The other six state representatives indicated that TA was linked to a credential, CEU/CEC or to enrollment in the billing system (see Table 25).

Table 25. *Training Linked to Certification, Credits or Other (n=12)*

Training Linked to Certification, Credits or Other	Frequency
No link to certification or credential	6
Certification	6
CEUs/CECs/early intervention points/units	4
Credential	1
Other (e.g., linked to enrollment in billing system)	1

**Supports or Incentives.** Each of the 12 state representatives with a TA system reported having supports provided to personnel (see Table 26).

Table 26. *Supports or Incentives Provided for Technical Assistance (n=12)*

Supports or Incentives Provided for Technical Assistance	Frequency
Paid time	8
Free training	4
Decided only at the local level	3
Reimbursed for travel expenses	2
Stipend/scholarship provided to trainee	1
Other: meets training requirements, intrinsic reward, networking, etc.	2

**Identification of TA Needs.** Most frequently, compliance or monitoring was used to identify the TA needs (see Table 27).

Table 27. *Identification of Technical Assistance Needs (n=12)*

Identification of Technical Assistance Needs	Frequency
Compliance/performance/monitoring	10
Provider/administrator/TA consultant input (surveys, training needs interview, self-assessments)	9
Federal and/or state initiatives	5
Personnel Preparation Training Committee (may include supervisors, parents, providers, stakeholders, etc.)	3
State credential/competencies	1
Evidence-based/best practice/research	1

**Content.** TA content focused primarily on service delivery (see Table 28).

Table 28. *Technical Assistance Content (n=12)*

Technical Assistance Content	Frequency
Service delivery	10
Data management system/outcome data	6
Disability-specific information	5
Early intervention policies and procedures	4
Providing/accessing professional development	3
Working with families	3
Risk topics (e.g., environmental risk/infant mental health)	2

**Evaluation of Technical Assistance.** All of the 12 states with a TA system evaluated the quality of TA (see Table 29).

Table 29. *Evaluation of Technical Assistance (n=12)*

Evaluation of Technical Assistance	Frequency
Verbal feedback	5
Compliance/monitoring/outcome data used	5
Trainee evaluation/survey forms	4

**Quality Assurance of Technical Assistance.** Nine state representatives reported that monitoring was used to ensure the impact of the TA (see Table 30).

Table 30. *Quality Assurance of Technical Assistance (n=12)*

Quality assurance of technical assistance	Frequency
Monitoring	9
Use feedback mechanism	2
Observe training/TA	1
Survey/evaluation	1

**Ongoing Professional Development.** Ten of the states with a TA system had a specific way to address the on-going professional development of those who provide the TA (see Table 31).

Table 31. *On-going Professional Development (n=12)*

On-going Professional Development	Frequency
Informational meetings (regional meetings/monthly meetings of trainers)	6
Conferences	5
Training support (Train the Trainer)	5
Written materials (listserv/journals)	3
No procedures in place	2
National organizations (NECTAC/webcasts/resource centers)	1

**Networking.** All twelve of the state representatives mentioned that they networked with other state agencies specifically for the provision of TA (see Table 32).

Table 32. *Networking (n=12)*

Networking	Frequency
Other State Agencies: Interagency Coordinating Councils / State T&TA Committees / Early Childhood Training Collaborative (Department of Health; Medical Quality Assurance Licensing Board; Child Protective Services; Healthy Families; Department of Health and Human Services; Department of Mental Health; Office of Child Care; Foster Care; Drug & Alcohol Office; Department of Mental Retardation; Department of Social Services; Medicaid; HeadStart & Child Care)	12
Universities (Higher Education)	4
Office of Special Education Programs / Department of Education	4
Contracted Training & TA Agencies / Provider Agencies	4
Professional Therapy Organizations (PT, OT, SLP, Medicine/Health)	3
Disability Organizations / Advocacy Associations (UCEDD, Easter Seals, Autism Programs, Sensory Disabilities Project, Schools for the Deaf & Blind Association for the Education of Young Children; Association for Special Education; Nemours Children Foundation)	3
Parent Groups / Parent Training Institutes	3
Childcare Resource & Referral Agencies / Special Education Resource Center (SERC)	2
NECTAC	1

### **Broad Based Questions Related to State Part C Training and TA Systems**

**CSPD.** All state representatives (n=51) were asked if they had a Comprehensive System for Personnel Development (CSPD). Forty-two states did not have a CSPD.

**Training Plan.** Table 33 depicts the aspects of personnel preparation addressed in the state training plan.

Table 33. *Aspects of Personnel Preparation Addressed in Training Plan (n=51)*

Aspects of Personnel Preparation Addressed in Training Plan	Frequency
Inservice education/TA system	29
Qualified personnel	28
Preservice system	28
Recruitment & retention/supply & demand	26
Dissemination	24
No response/not applicable/not answered	15
Other: Paraprofessional plan	1

**Broad-based Professional Development System.** Seven state representatives indicated that they had a broad based professional development system for all of early childhood, and one included paraprofessionals in their plan.

## Copy of Telephone Survey

Date \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Participant: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Circle one: Part C/619

### Study VI: Training And Technical Assistance Survey

Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ from the A.J. Pappanikou Center at the University of Connecticut Health Center. As part of the Center to Inform Personnel Preparation Policy and Practice in Early Intervention and Preschool Education, we are calling to ask you a few questions about your training and technical assistance (T/TA) in your state for personnel serving infants and toddlers under Part C of IDEA (or preschoolers under Part B, Section 619 of IDEA). We are trying to identify states that have systems of ongoing T/TA in place for which we might be able to do a more in-depth case study as we look at what works in regard to continuing education.

We would like to spend about 30 minutes with you while we ask you some questions about the type of training and TA that is available in your state (across disciplines) for those working with these populations. We have looked at your website and we have gotten some information in order to make this interview as short as possible. Is this a good time for you?

[IF YES, CONTINUE. IF NO, SCHEDULE A CONVENIENT TIME TO CALL BACK IN THE BOX BELOW.]

Your participation is voluntary and if you wish not to answer any of the questions, I will respect your decision. You will not be paid for completing this survey.

Questions about this study may be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr. Mary Beth Bruder, or IRB Representative at 860-679-8729 or 860-679-3054.

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

Yes       No

I would like to record our conversation to verify that the notes I take are accurate, do you agree to this?

Yes       No

Fill out the information below to schedule a more convenient time for telephone interview:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Date or day of week: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

First, we want to start with explaining what we are defining as systems of training and technical assistance. By system, we mean a systematic, sustainable approach to professional development that has dedicated resources such as an agency budget line-item, staffing and a dedicated agency that is responsible for the provision of the T/TA. A system has policies or procedures for determining professional development expectations, the content of the T/TA, for quality assurance and for measuring outcomes.

The system of training provides on-going, needs-based professional development that is provided over-time, has identified outcomes, a structure for the delivery of content (training modules, etc.) and has work-place applicability. A technical assistance system provides on-going, individualized professional development and problem-solving services to assist individuals, programs, and agencies in improving their services, management, policies, and/or outcomes.

A. Based on this definition, do you have a training system in place in your state? (If yes, complete 1-14).

Yes       No

B. Based on this definition, do you have a technical assistance system in place in your state? (If yes, complete 15-32).

Yes       No

{Regardless of responses to A and B, all participants answer 29-31.}

Based on your above response for training, please respond to the following questions.

1. Who funds the training?

(How do you determine how much money is allocated for training?—how much spent on training per year OR how what percentage of total budget is spent on training? If contracting out, how do you determine how much goes to each contracted agency? Is it a set amount, a percentage, and a certain amount per person?)

2. Who participates in the training?

3. Who provides the training? (**Probe: Tell me more about that... What trainings do they provide? Who attends those trainings? Are they regional or statewide trainings? If not statewide: how do people in other areas access similar training opportunities?**)

4. How is the training delivered, such as types of modalities (instructional methods)?

(Examples: workshops – how long are the workshops?, on-line trainings, traditional classrooms lectures, conferences, etc.)

5. Is there training specific to Part C/619 that is required of personnel?

6. Is the training linked to a certification, credential or continuing education credit?



7. Are there supports or incentives provided to personnel to encourage their participation in professional development, such as days off of work, funding, continuing education credits, etc.?
8. Please describe the procedures for identifying training needs. (*Probe: Tell me more about... competencies/standards/best practices/evidence-based research, What are your best practices? Where do you get the best practices, If using evidence based practices, where does the evidence come from? etc.*)
9. What has your current training content been this past year? (*Probe: What was the content during past years? Is there training specific to early language and literacy?*)  Yes  No
10. Please describe how the training is evaluated and outcomes assessed. (*Probe: Do you collect data? Are reports compiled from that data? Would be willing to send as a copy of those reports?*)
11. How is quality of the training assured? (*Clarification: How do you know the training is making a difference?*)
12. Are there procedures for addressing the re-tooling or on-going professional development of those who provide the training? (*Clarification: How do your trainers stay up to date on changes in the field?*)
13. What are similarities and/or differences in the training across disciplines serving this population? (*Clarification: Does every discipline take the same trainings?*) (*Probe: Are there differences in training requirements for part-time vs. full-time staff?*)
14. What networking with state professional organizations and other agencies specific to training occurs?

Based on your above response for technical assistance, please respond to the following questions.

15. Who funds the technical assistance? (How do you determine how much money is allocated for TA?—how much spent on TA per year OR how what percentage of total budget is spent on TA? If contracting out, how do you determine how much goes to each contracted agency? Is it a set amount, a percentage, and a certain amount per person?)

16. Who participates in the technical assistance?
17. Who provides the technical assistance? (**Probe: Tell me more about that... What types of technical assistance do they provide?**)
18. How is technical assistance delivered, such types of modalities (instructional methods)? (Examples: workshops – how long are the workshops?, on-line trainings, traditional classrooms lectures, conferences, etc.)
19. Is the technical assistance required of personnel? If not, are there other incentives for personnel to participate in professional development?
20. Is the technical assistance linked to a certification, credential or continuing education credit?
21. Are there supports provided to personnel to assist in their participation (days off of work, funding, etc.)?
22. Please describe the procedures for identifying technical assistance needs. (**Probe: Tell me more about... competencies/standards/best practices/evidence-based research, What are your best practices? Where do you get the best practices, If using evidence based practices, where does the evidence come from? etc.**)
23. What has your current training content this past year? (**Probe: What was the content during past years?**)  
Is there TA specific to early language and literacy? Yes / No
24. Please describe how the technical assistance is evaluated and outcomes assessed.
25. How is quality of the technical assistance assured? (**Clarification: How do you know the technical assistance is making a difference?**)

26. Are there procedures for addressing the re-tooling or on-going professional development of those who provide the technical assistance? **(Clarification: How do your trainers stay up to date on changes in the field?)**
27. What are similarities and/or differences in the technical assistance across disciplines serving this population? **(Clarification: Does every discipline receive the same technical assistance?) (Probe: Are there differences in technical assistance requirements for part-time vs. full-time staff?)**
28. What networking with state professional organizations and other agencies specific to technical assistance occurs?

All participants: please respond to the following questions.

29. Do you have a combined CSPD (Comprehensive System for Personnel Development) or training plan for Part C and 619? **(Probe if appropriate: If you are no longer referring to your training plan as a CSPD, what are you calling it?)**
30. What aspects of personnel preparation are addressed in your Part C or combined Part C and 619 CSPD/ training plan? **(Probe as needed: Does your training plan include the following components: qualified personnel, inservice education and technical assistance system, preservice system, dissemination, recruitment & retention/ supply & demand?)**
31. Does your state have a broad based professional development system for all of early childhood? (e.g., a professional development system for child care, Head Start, education, state preschool, Part C and 619 personnel, etc.). If so, where is it housed, what agency is responsible for it? Please describe it. Does it meet the needs for Part C and 619? If yes, please explain.

## Survey with Frequencies and States with a Training/TA System

Date \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Participant: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Circle one: Part C/619

### Study VI: Training And Technical Assistance Survey

Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ from the A.J. Papanikou Center at the University of Connecticut Health Center. As part of the Center to Inform Personnel Preparation Policy and Practice in Early Intervention and Preschool Education, we are calling to ask you a few questions about your training and technical assistance (T/TA) in your state for personnel serving infants and toddlers under Part C of IDEA (or preschoolers under Part B, Section 619 of IDEA). We are trying to identify states that have systems of ongoing T/TA in place for which we might be able to do a more in-depth case study as we look at what works in regard to continuing education.

We would like to spend about 30 minutes with you while we ask you some questions about the type of training and TA that is available in your state (across disciplines) for those working with these populations. We have looked at your website and we have gotten some information in order to make this interview as short as possible. Is this a good time for you?

[IF YES, CONTINUE. IF NO, SCHEDULE A CONVENIENT TIME TO CALL BACK IN THE BOX BELOW.]

Your participation is voluntary and if you wish not to answer any of the questions, I will respect your decision. You will not be paid for completing this survey.

Questions about this study may be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr. Mary Beth Bruder, at 860-679-1500. Questions regarding the rights of research subjects should be directed to an IRB Representative at 860-679-8729 or 860-679-3054.

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

Yes       No

I would like to record our conversation to verify that the notes I take are accurate, do you agree to this?

Yes       No

Fill out the information below to schedule a more convenient time for telephone interview:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Date or day of week: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

First, we want to start with explaining what we are defining as systems of training and technical assistance. By system, we mean a systematic, sustainable approach to professional development that has dedicated resources such as an agency budget line-item, staffing and a dedicated agency that is responsible for the provision of the T/TA. A system has policies or procedures for determining professional development expectations, the content of the T/TA, for quality assurance and for measuring outcomes.

The system of training provides on-going, needs-based professional development that is provided over-time, has identified outcomes, a structure for the delivery of content (training modules, etc.) and has work-place applicability. A technical assistance system provides on-going, individualized professional development and problem-solving services to assist individuals, programs, and agencies in improving their services, management, policies, and/or outcomes.

A. Based on this definition, do you have a training system in place in your state? (If yes, complete 1-14).

State coordinators' responses:

Code	Title	Frequency
1	Yes	42
1.1	Yes, with qualifiers	1 (ME)
2	No	6
3	Not sure	1 (MD)
4	Not specified	1 (WY)

B. Based on this definition, do you have a technical assistance system in place in your state? (If yes, complete 15-32).

State coordinators' responses:

Code	Title	Frequency
1	Yes	47
2	No	3
3	Not specified	1 (WY)

Based on team decision:

State	Training		TA	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Alabama	X			X
Alaska		X		X
Arizona	X			X
Arkansas	X			X
California	X		X	
Colorado	X			X
Connecticut		X		X
Delaware		X		X
DC		X		X
Florida		X		X
Georgia		X		X
Hawaii		X		X
Idaho		X		X
Illinois	X			X
Indiana		X	X	
Iowa		X		X
Kansas	X		X	
Kentucky		X		X
Louisiana		X		X
Maine		X		X
Maryland	X			X
Massachusetts		X		X
Michigan	X			X
Minnesota	X		X	
Mississippi		X		X
Missouri		X		X
Montana	X			X
Nebraska	X		X	

State	Training		TA	
Nevada	X			X
New Hampshire	X		X	
New Jersey		X		X
New Mexico		X		X
New York		X		X
North Dakota		X		X
North Carolina	X		X	
Ohio	X		X	
Oklahoma		X		X
Oregon		X		X
Pennsylvania	X		X	
Rhode Island		X		X
South Carolina		X		X
Tennessee		X		X
Texas	X		X	
Utah		X	X	
Vermont		X		X
Virginia		X		X
Virgin Islands		X		X
Washington		X		X
West Virginia	X			X
Wisconsin	X		X	
Wyoming		X		X

The following codes and frequencies are provided for states that DO have a training system

1. Who funds the training?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by state:
1	Federal	18	90%	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NV, NH, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI
2	State	10	50%	AL, IL, KS, MD, MN, MT, NE, NC, PA, TX
3	Medicaid	3	15%	IL, KS, OH
4	Third party reimbursement	0	0%	
5	Family fees	1	5%	IL

2. Who participates in the training?

Code	Title	# of Cases	Frequency	Response by State:
1	Service coordinators	6	30%	AL, AZ, CA, CO, OH, WV
2	Early Intervention Providers	20	100%	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI
3	Families	8	40%	AL, AZ, CA, MD, NE, PA, TX, WI
4	University Faculty	2	10%	AL, AZ
5	Other Early Childhood/ School-Age Personnel	12	60%	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, MI, MN, NC, OH, PA, TX, WI

3. Who provides the training?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by state
1	Online Training	1	5%	NV
2	Out of State Expert	5	25%	AL, AZ, CA, MN, PA
3	National Resource (e.g., NECTAC, ECO)	1	5%	AZ
4	Instate Expert/Consultant	20	100%	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NV, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI, NE
5	Early Intervention Providers	3	15%	CO, AL, NE
6	Parents	1	5%	CO



4. How is the training delivered, such as types of modalities (instructional methods)?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	States
1	Annual Meeting/ Symposium/Conference	8	40%	AL, CA, KS, MN, NV, PA, TX, NE
2	Distance Learning	16	80%	AL,AZ, CA, IL, MD, MI, MN, MT, NV, NC, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI, NE
3	Workshops (e.g., classroom/lecture, small group)	19	95%	AL, AZ, AR, CA,CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NV, NH, NC, OH, TX, WV, WI, NE
4	Written Material (e.g., memos/email/listserv)	0		
5	Regular Staff Meetings	0		
6	Applied Learning (e.g., hands-on/vignettes/ case studies/mentorship/ shadowing)	3	15%	AL, MD, NV

5. Is there training specific to Part C/619 that is required of personnel?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by State:
1	Yes	15	75%	AL, AZ, AR, CO, IL, MN, MT, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, TX, WV, WI
2	No	5	25%	CA, KS, MD, MI, PA

6. Is the training linked to a certification, credential or continuing education credit?

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	No	2 (10%)	CO, MI
2	Yes		
2.1	Certification	2 (10%)	KS, NC
2.2	Credential	5 (25%)	IL, MN, MT, OH, WV
2.3	CEUs/CECs/Early Intervention Points/Units	15 (75%)	AL, AR, CA, IL, KS, MD, MN, MT, NE, NV, NH, OH, PA, TX, WI
2.4	Other (e.g., linked to enrollment in billing system)	5 (25%)	AZ, CA, KS, NH, WI

7. Are there supports or incentives provided to personnel to encourage their participation in professional development, such as days off of work, funding, continuing education credits, etc.?

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	No supports or incentives provided	0 (0%)	
2	Yes		
2.1	Free training	9 (45%)	CA, IL, KS, MT, NE, NV, NH, OH, WI
2.2	Paid time	10 (50%)	CA, CO, KS, MI, MT, NV, OH, PA, TX, WI
2.3	Stipend/scholarship provided to trainee	4 (20%)	AL, CO, MN, NE
2.4	CEU's offered	8 (40%)	AL, AR, IL, NV, NC, OH, TX, WV
2.5	Reimbursed for travel expenses	6 (30%)	CA, CO, KS, MN, NE, NV
2.6	Other: meets training requirements, intrinsic reward, networking, etc.	8 (40%)	AL, AZ, MD, MT, NE, TX, WV, WI
2.7	Decided only at the local level	1 (5%)	MD

8. Please describe the procedures for identifying training needs.

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	No procedure in place	0 (0%)	
2	Personnel Preparation Training Committee (may include supervisors, parents, providers, stakeholders, etc.)	12 (60%)	AL, CA, KS, MD, MN, MT, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, TX
3	Provider/Administrator/TA Consultant Input (surveys, training needs interview, self-assessments)	18 (90%)	AL, AZ, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NE, NV, NH, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI
4	Federal and/or State Initiatives	7 (35%)	AZ, IL, KS, MT, NE, OH, PA
5	Compliance/Performance/Monitoring	12 (60%)	AZ, AR, CA, CO, KS, MI, MN, NE, NH, OH, PA, WI
6	State Credential/Competencies	6 (30%)	AZ, AR, IL, MI, MT, OH
7	Evidence-based/Best Practice/Research	11 (55%)	AL, AZ, CA, CO, KS, MI, NV, OH, PA, TX, WI

## 9. What has your current training content been this past year?

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	Policies and Procedures	18 (90%)	AL, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MD, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI
2	Service Delivery	19 (95%)	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI
3	Working with Families	11 (55%)	AL, CA, CO, IL, MD, MI, MN, NE, NV, NC, WI
4	Early Childhood Risk Factors	3 (15%)	AL, IL, MI
5	Child Development	7 (35%)	AL, IL, KS, MT, NE, OH, WI
6	Disability Information	10 (50%)	AL, CA, IL, MD, MI, NE, NV, PA, TX, WI
7	Professional Development	0 (0%)	
8	Data management/Outcomes	3 (15%)	AZ, AR, CO

\*Many state coordinators reported only a sample of the trainings offered due to the large number of trainings available throughout the year

Is there training specific to early language and literacy?  Yes  No

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	Yes	8 (40%)	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, MN, MT, NE
2	No	11 (55%)	IL, KS, MD, MI, NV, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, WI
3	No response	1 (5%)	WV

10. Please describe how the training is evaluated and outcomes assessed.

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	No procedure	0 (0%)	
2	Has a procedure	20 (100%)	
2.1	Verbal Feedback	3 (15%)	AZ, CO, WI
2.2	Trainee Exams	3 (15%)	AL, MI, NV
2.3	Trainee Evaluation/survey Forms	18 (90%)	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MI, MT, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, WV, WI
2.4	NECTAC Evaluation Procedure Used	0 (0%)	
2.5	Compliance/monitoring/outcome data used	5 (20%)	MD, NE, NC, TX, MI

11. How is quality of the training assured?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by state
1	Monitoring	14	70%	AL, AZ, AR, CA, IL, KS, MI, MN, NV, NH, OH, TX, WV, WI
2	Survey/evaluation	7	35%	CO, KS, MD, NE, PA, WV, WI
3	Observe Training	1	5%	NE
4	Using feedback mechanism	4	20%	MT, NC, TX, WI
5	No formal procedure in place	0	0%	

12. Are there procedures for addressing the re-tooling or on-going professional development of those who provide the training?

Codes	Title	Frequency	Response by State
1	Yes	1 (5%)	MI
1.1	Conferences	5 (25%)	CO, NV, NH, PA, TX
1.2	National Organizations (webcasts/ resource centers)	5 (25%)	CO, MN, NV, TX, WI
1.3	Informational Meetings (regional meetings/monthly meetings of trainers)	6 (30%)	AZ, IL, MN, NE, PA, WI
1.4	Training Support (Train the Trainer)	4 (20%)	CA, NE, PA, WV
1.5	Written Materials (listserv/journals/ NECTAC information)	6 (30%)	KS, MN, NV, NC, TX, WI
2	No procedures in place	5 (25%)	AL, AR, MD, MT, OH

13. What are similarities and/or differences in the training across disciplines serving this population?

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	No differences across disciplines	13 (65%)	AZ, CO, MD, MI, MN, MT, NE, NC, NV, NH, PA, TX, WV
2	Have Discipline Specific Trainings (at least sometimes)	7 (35%)	AL, AR, CA, IL, KS, OH, WI

## 14. What networking with state professional organizations and other agencies specific to training occurs?

Code	Title	# of Cases	Frequency	Response by State:
1	No networking	0	n/a	
2	Yes (but no examples provided)	0	n/a	
3	Universities (Higher Ed.)	11	55%	AL, IL, KS, MN, NE, NV, NH, NC, TX, WV, WI
4	NECTAC	2	10%	AZ, NC
5	OSEP / Department of Education / Part 619 / Part B	6	30%	KS, MT, NE, NV, NH, NC
6	Professional Therapy Organizations (PT, OT, SLP, Medicine/Health)	4	20%	AZ, CA, NE, WI
7	Other State Agencies: Interagency Coordinating Councils / State T&TA Committees / Early Childhood Training Collaborative (Department of Health; Medical Quality Assurance Licensing Board; CPS; Healthy Families; DHHS; Dept. of Mental Health; Office of Child Care; Foster Care; Drug & Alcohol Office; DMR; DSS; Medicaid; Headstart & Child Care )	17	85%	AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, KS, MD, MI, MN, MT, NE, NH, NC, PA, TX, WV, WI
8	Childcare Resource & Referral Agencies / Special Education Resource Center (SERC)	4	20%	KS, NE, NC, PA
9	Disability Organizations / Advocacy Associations (UCEDD, Easter Seals, Autism Programs, Sensory Disabilities Project, Schools for the Deaf & Blind Association for the Education of Young Children; Association for Special Education; Nemours Children Foundation; )	4	20%	MI, MN, NE, NH
10	Parent Groups / Parent Training Institutes	5	25%	KS, MN, NE, OH, TX
11	Contracted Training & TA Agencies / Provider Agencies	5	25%	CA, MD, MI, NE, NC
12	Other State Part C Offices & Programs (share documents)	1	5%	NV

## Technical Assistance

*The following codes and frequencies are provided for states that DO have a TA system*

15. Who funds the technical assistance?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by state:
1	Federal	9	75%	CA, IN, KS, NH, OH, PA, TX, UT, WI
2	State	9	75%	IN, KS, MN, NE, NC, OH, PA, TX, UT
3	Medicaid	1	8%	OH

16. Who participates in the technical assistance?

Code	Title	# of Cases	Frequency	Response by State:
1	Service coordinators	1	8%	CA
2	Early Intervention Providers	12	100%	CA, IN, KS, MN, NE, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, UT, WI
3	Families	2	17%	PA, NE
4	University Faculty	0		
5	Other Early Childhood/ School-Age Personnel	4	33%	CA, MN, NE, PA

17. Who provides the technical assistance?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by state
1	Online Training	0		
2	Out of State Expert	0		
3	National Resource (e.g., NECTAC, ECO)	0		
4	Instate Expert/Consultant	12	100%	CA, IN, KS, MN, NE, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, UT, WI
5	Direct Providers	1	8.3%	NE
6	Parents	0		

18. How is technical assistance delivered, such types of modalities (instructional methods)?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	States
1	Annual Meeting/Symposium/Conference	1	8.3%	NE
2	Distance Learning	3	25%	KS, NE, WI
3	Workshops (e.g., classroom/lecture, small group/onsite/in person/face to face)	12	100%	CA, IN, KS, MN, NE, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, UT, WI
4	Written Material (e.g., memos/ listserv)	1	8.3%	KS
5	Regular Staff Meetings	1	8.3%	OH
6	Applied Learning (e.g., hands-on/vignettes/case studies/mentorship/shadowing)	0	0	
7	Phone Calls/Emails based on Individual Requests	8	66.7 %	CA, KS, MN, NC, OH, TX, UT, WI

19. Is the technical assistance required of personnel? If not, are there other incentives for personnel to participate in professional development?

Code	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by state:
1	Yes	10	83%	CA, IN, KS, NE, NH, NC, OH, PA, UT, WI
2	No	1	8%	TX
88	Not Applicable	1	8%	MN

20. Is the technical assistance linked to a certification, credential or continuing education credit?

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	No	6 (50%)	CA, MN, NE, NH, OH, TX
2	Yes	6 (50 %)	
2.1	Certification		
2.2	Credential	1 (8%)	UT
2.3	CEUs/CECs/Early Intervention Points/Units	4 (33%)	IN, KS, NC, PA
2.4	Other (e.g., linked to enrollment in billing system)	1 (8%)	WI



21. Are there supports provided to personnel to assist in their participation (days off of work, funding, etc.)?

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	No supports or incentives provided	0 (0%)	
2	Yes		
2.1	Free training	4 (33%)	IN, KS, NC, NE
2.2	Paid time	8 (66%)	IN, KS, MN, NH, NC, OH, PA, UT
2.3	Stipend/scholarship provided to trainee	1 (8%)	NE
2.4	CEU's offered	0 (0%)	
2.5	Reimbursed for travel expenses	2 (17%)	KS, NE
2.6	Other: meets training requirements, intrinsic reward, networking, etc.	2 (17%)	KS, NE
2.7	Decided only at the local level	3 (25%)	CA, TX, WI

22. Please describe the procedures for identifying technical assistance needs.

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	No procedure in place	0 (0%)	
2	Personnel Preparation Training Committee (may include supervisors, parents, providers, stakeholders, etc.)	3 (25%)	MN, NE, UT
3	Provider/Administrator/TA Consultant Input (surveys, training needs interview, self-assessments)	9 (75%)	CA, IN, KS, NH, OH, NE, PA, TX, UT, WI
4	Federal and/or State Initiatives	5 (41%)	CA, KS, NE, OH, UT
5	Compliance/Performance/Monitoring	10 (83%)	CA, IN, KS, MN, NE, NH, OH, PA, TX, WI
6	State Credential/Competencies	1 (8%)	TX
7	Evidence-based/Best Practice/Research	1 (8%)	WI

23. What has your current training content this past year? (Probe: What was the content during past years?)

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	Early Intervention Policies and Procedures	4 (33%)	KS, NE, OH, PA
2	Service Delivery	10 (83%)	CA, IN, MN, NE, NH, NC, PA, TX, UT, WI
3	Data management system/Outcome Data	6 (50%)	IN, KS, NC, OH, PA, UT
4	Disability-specific information	5 (42%)	MN, HN, PA, TX, WI
5	Working with Families	3 (25%)	IN, NE, NH
6	Risk topics (e.g., environmental risk/ infant mental health)	2 (17%)	NE, TX
7	Providing/Accessing Professional Development	3 (25%)	NH, TX, UT

Is there TA specific to early language and literacy?  YES  NO

Code	Title	Frequency	State
	Yes	2 (17%)	NE, UT
	No	7 (58%)	CA, IN, KS, MN, NH, OH, TX
	Don't know	1 (8%)	PA
	No response (attempted follow-up)	2 (17%)	NC, WI

24. Please describe how the technical assistance is evaluated and outcomes assessed.

Code	Title	Frequency	States
1	No procedure	0 (0%)	
2	Has a procedure	100 (100%)	
2.1	Verbal Feedback	5 (42%)	CA, IN, MN, TX, WI
2.2	Trainee Exams		
2.3	Trainee Evaluation/survey Forms	4 (33%)	CA, IN, KS, NE PA
2.4	NECTAC Evaluation Procedure Used		
2.5	Compliance/monitoring/outcome data used	5 (42%)	KS, NH, NC, OH, UT

25. How is quality of the technical assistance assured?

Codes	Title	# of cases	Frequency	Response by State
1	Monitoring	9	70.0%	CA, KS, MN, NH, NC, OH, PA, UT, WI
2	Survey/Evaluation	1	8.3%	NE
3	Use feedback mechanism	2	16.7%	IN, TX
4	Observe training/TA	1	8.3%	NE
5	No formal procedure in place	0	0.0%	

26. Are there procedures for addressing the re-tooling or on-going professional development of those who provide the technical assistance?

Codes	Title	Frequency	Response by State
1	Yes		
1.1	Conferences	5 (41.7%)	NH, PA, TX, UT, WI
1.2	National Organizations (NECTAC/ webcasts/resource centers)	1 (8.3%)	UT
1.3	Informational Meetings (regional meetings/monthly meetings of trainers)	6 (50.0%)	CA, IN, NE, NC, UT, WI
1.4	Training Support (Train the Trainer)	5 (41.7%)	CA, NH, NC, NE, OH
1.5	Written Materials (listserv/journals)	3 (25.0%)	TX, UT, WI
2	No procedures in place	2 (16.7%)	KS, MN

27. What are similarities and/or differences in the technical assistance across disciplines serving this population?

Code	Title	# of Cases	Frequency	Response by State:
1	No differences across disciplines	3	25%	IN, NE, NC
2	Discipline Specific Trainings (at least in some cases)	8	67%	CA, KS, MN, OH, PA, TX, UT, WI
3	No response	1	8%	NH

28. What networking with state professional organizations and other agencies specific to technical assistance occurs?

Code	Title	# of Cases	Frequency	Response by State:
1	No networking	0	n/a	
2	Yes (but no examples provided)	0	n/a	
3	Universities (Higher Ed.)	4	33%	NE, NH, NC, TX
4	NECTAC	1	8%	NC
5	OSEP / Department of Education / Part 619 / Part B	4	33%	KS, NE, NH, NC,
6	Professional Therapy Organizations (PT, OT, SLP, Medicine/Health)	3	25%	CA, NE, TX
7	Other State Agencies: Interagency Coordinating Councils / State T&TA Committees / Early Childhood Training Collaborative (Department of Health; Medical Quality Assurance Licensing Board; CPS; Healthy Families; DHHS; Dept. of Mental Health; Office of Child Care; Foster Care; Drug & Alcohol Office; DMR; DSS; Medicaid; Headstart & Child Care )	12	100%	CA, IN, KS, MN, NE, NH, NC, OH, PA, TX, UT, WI
8	Childcare Resource & Referral Agencies / Special Education Resource Center (SERC)	2	17%	NE, NC
9	Disability Organizations / Advocacy Associations (UCEDD, Easter Seals, Autism Programs, Sensory Disabilities Project, Schools for the Deaf & Blind Association for the Education of Young Children; Association for Special Education; Nemours Children Foundation; )	3	25%	NE, NH, PA
10	Parent Groups / Parent Training Institutes	3	25%	NE, PA, TX
11	Contracted Training & TA Agencies / Provider Agencies	4	33%	NE, NC, PA, UT
12	Other State Part C Offices & Programs (share documents)	0	n/a	

All participants: please respond to the following questions.

29. Do you have a combined CSPD(Comprehensive System for Personnel Development) or training plan for Part C and 619? (Probe if appropriate: If you are no longer referring to your training plan as a CSPD, what are you calling it?)

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	Yes	9 (18%)	CT, DC, LA, MN, MT, NE, OR, PA, WY
2	No	42 (82%)	AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, ME, MD, MA, MI, MS, MO, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, VI, VA, WA, WV, WI

30. What aspects of personnel preparation are addressed in your Part C or combined Part C and 619 CSPD/ training plan? Probe as needed: Does your training plan include the following components: qualified personnel, inservice education and technical assistance system, preservice system, dissemination, recruitment & retention/ supply & demand?)

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	No response/not applicable/not answered	15 (29%)	AK, DC, ME, MI, MO, MT, NE, NV, OK, OR, TX, VA, WA, WI, WY
2	Qualified Personnel	28 (55%)	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, HI, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, MA, MN, MS, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, RI, SC, UT, VI
3	Inservice education/TA system	29 (57%)	AL, AZ, AK, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, MN, MS, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, PA, RI, SC, UT, VT, VI, WV
4	Preservice system	28 (55%)	AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MA, MN, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, RI, UT, VI
5	Dissemination	24 (47%)	AL, CA, CO, CT, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MN, MS, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, RI, TX, VI, WV
6	Recruitment & Retention/ Supply & Demand	26 (51%)	AL, CA, CO, CT, DE, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MA, MN, MS, NJ, NM, NC, RI, TX, VI, WV
7	Other: Paraprofessional plan	1 (2%)	CA

31. Does your state have a broad based professional development system for all of early childhood? (e.g., a professional development system for child care, Head Start, education, state preschool, Part C and 619 personnel, etc.). If so, where is it housed, what agency is responsible for it? Please describe it. Does it meet the needs for Part C and 619? If yes, please explain.

Code	Title	Frequency	State
1	Yes (entire definition met)	7 (14%)	AL, CO, MT, NE, NM, PA, WY
2	No (some or all of definition not met)	44 (86%)	AK, AZ, AR, CA, CT, DE, DC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NV, NH, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, VI, VA, WA, WV, WI