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

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT HEALTH CENTER

Table of Contents

Data Report

Study II Data Report: The Higher Education Survey for Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education Personnel Preparation - Instructional Methods and Course Content Used by Institutions of Higher Education to Address EI/ECSE

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. This report focuses on instructional strategies and course content used in institutions of higher education that address service related fields of Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE). 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 states were included in the sample.

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

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

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

DATA ANALYSIS

Sample Composition

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

Respondents were given the option to describe their program from choices of 17 specific academic programs, blended program (e.g., focus on early childhood educational and early childhood special

education) or 'other.' All 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 representatives from 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

This report focused on the instruction offered by institutions of higher education related to the fields that comprise EI/ECSE. This report begins with an overview of the instructional delivery methods (e.g. on-campus courses, on-line courses, and intensive institutes) used by the respondents. Cross-disciplinary collaboration was also examined. Respondents indicated collaborative relationships that they held and the approaches used to encourage these relationships. Instructional methods were identified as they applied to students' learning of the principles and practices outlined by IDEA and EI/ECSE. Next, the report focused on course offerings specific to: assistive technology; families; inclusion/natural environments; research and evaluation, and team process. The final section discussed the types of opportunities programs offered students to learn about children between the ages of birth and five years.

Instructional Methods

Respondents identified the instructional methods that they used from a list of eight options (see Table 6).

Table 6. *Instructional Delivery Methods (n = 728)*

Instructional Delivery Method	Frequency	Percent
Credits offered through on-campus courses	689	95
Credits offered through web-supported courses	245	34
Credits offered through off-campus courses	203	28
Credits offered through on-line courses	164	23
Credits offered as part of weekend college	65	9
Credits offered through intensive institutes	62	9
Credits offered through instructional television	54	7
Credits offered through correspondence courses	12	2
Other	30	4

The data were also analyzed by sub-group. Results from chi-square tests by program type revealed significant differences for three instructional methods: intensive institutes [x^2 (18, n = 728) = 35.942, *p* =.007]; web-supported courses [x^2 (18, n = 728) = 32.983, *p* =.017]; and on-campus courses [x^2 (18, n = 728) = 29.893, *p* =.038] (see Appendix D, Table D1).

When examining the data by degree type, a significant difference was found for web-supported courses. Respondents representing undergraduate programs (38%) reported offering the most web-supported courses and doctoral programs reported offering the least [x^2 (5, n = 720) = 17.289, *p* =.004]. In addition, a significant difference was found for intensive institutes with respondents from masters programs (15%) using this method with greater frequency than the other types of programs [x^2 (5, n = 720) = 17.755, *p* =.003] (see Appendix D, Table D2).

Results from chi-square tests of instructional methods by Carnegie classification indicated that there was a significant difference in the use of web-supported courses [x^2 (4, n = 728) = 11.543, *p* =.021]. Respondents from master's colleges and universities reported offering more web-supported courses than the other types of institutions. In addition, respondents from associate colleges tended to report offering online courses in greater numbers [x^2 (4, n = 728) = 10.226, *p* =.037] (see Appendix D, Table D2).

Respondents representing programs in public four-year institutions reported using six of the nine the identified instructional delivery methods with greater frequency than respondents from programs in private four-year institutions (see Appendix D, Table D2). Significant differences were found for web-supported courses [x^2 (1, n = 595) = 14.826, *p* =.000], instructional television [x^2 (1, n = 595) = 14.309, *p* =.000], online courses [x^2 (1, n = 595) = 10.763, *p* =.001], and off-campus courses [x^2 (1, n = 595) = 6.489, *p* =.011].

When examining the data by geographic region, significant differences were found for instructional television [x^2 (3, n = 728) = 11.880, *p* =.008], correspondence courses [x^2 (3, n = 728) = 11.603, *p* =.009], web-supported courses [x^2 (3, n = 728) = 10.671, *p* =.014], and on-line courses [x^2 (3, n = 728) = 10.321, *p* =.016] (see Appendix D, Table D2).

Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration

Over one-half (55%) of the respondents reported that they collaborate with programs outside their discipline to offer cross-disciplinary courses or practica for their students (See Table 7).

Table 7. *Respondents Reporting Collaboration with Other Programs Outside of Their Discipline (n=730)*

Collaboration	Frequency	Percent
Yes	403	55
No	296	41
Not sure	31	4
Total	730	

Respondents who reported that they collaborate (55%, n=403) also identified the programs with which they partner. The data reveal some anticipated relationships. For example, two-thirds of the education of the hearing impaired programs (67%, n=4) collaborated with audiology. Similarly, two-thirds of the occupational therapy (67%, n=18) programs worked with physical therapy programs and vice versa (68%, n=13). Early intervention programs most frequently associated with psychology (86%, n=6), general special education (71%, n=5), and early childhood special education (57%, n=4) (see Appendix E, Table E1).

ANOVAs were conducted for sub-groups to determine whether significant differences existed regarding the number of programs with which respondents reported collaborating. No significant differences were found for any of the sub-groups (see Table 8). However, early intervention programs are most likely to collaborate with other programs, averaging 8 cross-disciplinary collaborations. Speech and language pathology programs also collaborate frequently with an average of 6 programs. Recreation therapy programs have the lowest collaboration rate with 3 programs. Specialized institutions (5) tend to collaborate with high numbers of programs as do graduate programs (masters = 4, doctorate = 4) (see Table 9).

Table 8. *Overall Collaboration by Program (n=399)*

Discipline	Frequency	Mean	SD
Audiology	1	4.0	-
Counseling	21	3.9	3.8
Early Childhood Education	46	3.6	2.7
Early Childhood Special Education	21	3.6	2.7
Early Intervention	7	7.7	6.3
Education of Hearing Impaired	6	3.8	1.9
Education of Visually Impaired	5	3.0	1.2
Family Therapy	4	3.3	2.6
Nursing	65	5.1	4.8
Nutrition	8	3.1	2.5
Occupational Therapy	27	4.9	4.6
Physical Therapy	19	4.5	3.3
Psychology	37	3.8	3.9
Recreation Therapy	12	2.5	2.6
Social Work	25	4.2	5.4
Special Education	28	4.5	3.8
Speech & Language Pathology	26	6.0	4.5
Blended Program	24	4.0	3.7
Other	17	4.5	3.7
Total	399	4.3	4.0

Table 9. *Instructional Delivery Methods by Subgroup*

Sub-Group	Frequency	Mean	SD
Degree Type			
Associates	47	3.9	3.0
Undergraduate	122	3.0	3.9
Masters	141	4.4	4.1
Doctorate	21	4.4	4.5
Multiple Degrees	47	5.4	4.8
Other	17	4.7	3.1
Total	395	4.4	4.0
Carnegie Classification			
Doctoral/Research Universities	139	4.6	4.0
Masters Colleges and Universities	148	4.3	4.1
Baccalaureate Colleges	39	3.7	3.8
Associates Colleges	51	4.1	3.6
Specialized Institutions	22	5.1	4.5
Total	399	4.3	4.0
Institutional Control			
Public, 4 year or above	226	4.5	4.2
Private, 4 year or above	124	4.2	3.9
Total	350	4.4	4.1
Region			
Northeast	112	4.1	3.9
Southeast	96	4.0	3.5
Midwest	133	4.6	4.3
West	58	4.8	4.3
Total	399	4.3	4.0

Cross-Disciplinary Features

Respondents were asked to select the types of activities they used when collaborating with other disciplines. The most common strategies were allowing students to take courses with students from other disciplines (67%) and having courses offered and listed jointly across program areas within a college or school (39%). A list of the activities and the frequency of respondents reporting using such collaborative measures is represented in Table 10.

Table 10. *Respondents Participating in Cross-disciplinary Activities (n =399)*

Cross-disciplinary Features	Frequency	Percent
Courses are taken with students from different disciplines	268	67
Courses are offered and listed jointly across program areas within a college or school	157	39
Students enrolled in the program represent different disciplines	152	38
Courses are team taught by instructors from different disciplines or different programs	147	37
Students are placed in practicum setting outside of the program's discipline area	131	33
Students across disciplines complete field experiences together	126	32
Practicum experiences are supervised by faculty or personnel outside the disciplinary area of the program	112	28
The program's steering committee is comprised of individuals from multiple discipline	110	28
Courses are offered and listed jointly across programs across a college or school	105	26
Other	44	11

Chi-square tests were conducted to determine whether certain subgroups were more likely to use specific cross-disciplinary features. When examining the data by program type, significant differences existed for seven of the features (see Appendix E, Table E2). There was a tendency for early intervention and occupational therapy to be actively engaged in a variety of collaborative efforts while nursing and nutrition demonstrated less activity.

When examining the data by degree type, chi-square test results indicated significant differences in the use of four cross-disciplinary features: Students enrolled in the program represent different disciplines [x^2 (5, n = 395) = 17.774, p =.003], courses are taken with students from different disciplines [x^2 (5, n = 395) = 23.177, p =.000], Practicum experiences are supervised by faculty or personnel outside the disciplinary area [x^2 (5, n = 395) = 18.589, p =.002], and students across disciplines complete field experiences together [x^2 (5, n = 395) = 12.238, p =.032]. In

all four of these cases, masters degree programs were most likely to use these features and associates degree programs were least likely (see Appendix E, Table E3).

Analysis conducted by Carnegie classification revealed significant differences for five of the identified cross-disciplinary features (see Appendix E, Table E3). When examining the data by institutional control, it appears that respondents representing programs in public institutions were significantly more likely to report that students from different disciplines complete field experiences together [x^2 (1, n = 350) = 8.230, p =.004], and that their programs' steering committee was comprised of individuals from multiple disciplines [x^2 (1, n = 350) = 6.289, p =.012] than respondents from private institutions. However, respondents from private institutions were significantly more likely to offer courses that are team taught by instructors from different discipline or programs than respondents from public institutions [x^2 (1, n = 350) = 5.175, p =.023].

There was little variation in the reported use of cross-disciplinary features when comparing data from each geographic region. An exception was offering and listing courses jointly across program areas within a college or school. Almost half (48%) of the respondents in the Western part of the country reported this while only one-quarter (27%) of respondents in the Southeast did so [x^2 (3, n = 399) = 8.814, p =.032]. In addition, respondents in the West (53%) were more likely than respondents in the Midwest (29%) to place students in practicum settings outside of the program's discipline area.

On average respondents reported collaborating using 3 of the identified approaches. ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the number of collaborative features used by sub-groups. There was a significant difference among program type with a range of 7 features being used by early intervention programs and 2 features reported by nursing programs [F (17, 380) = 4.272, p = .000)]. A significant difference was found for degree type [F (5, 394) = 4.465, p = .001)]. Respondents representing masters degree programs reported using 4 approaches while associates degree programs used only 2. Doctoral research universities (4) reported using the highest average number of approaches and Associates Colleges (2) reported the fewest [F (4, 398) = 7.657, p = .000)].

Instruction Related to the Principles and Practices of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education

Respondents (735) identified the instructional methods used to use to promote students' learning of principles/practices of IDEA and Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education. The overall number and percent of respondents indicating that they addressed a given topic are listed on the left column of the table in Appendix F, Table F1. Child development was addressed most frequently (97%) by programs and inclusion was addressed by the least number (51%) of programs.

Class lecture was clearly the primary instructional strategy used to teach principles and practices associated with IDEA with 93% of respondents reporting using this method in some capacity. Respondents indicated that family-centered practices were most commonly addressed in class lecture (98%). Within class lecture, inclusion (86%) and assistive technology (83%) were the least addressed issues.

Overall, nearly three-quarters (72%) of the respondents reported using field experiences. They most frequently used field experiences to address child-focused interventions (85%) and were least likely to use this method to provide learning opportunities for students with respect to due process (44%) and zero rejection (48%).

On average, in-class simulation was used by about one-half (46%) of the respondents. This instructional method was used most frequently to teach about team process (60%), and assessment models (58%). Only one-quarter of the respondents used this instructional method to convey topics regarding zero rejection (25%), due process (26%), and free appropriate public education (26%).

Less than one-quarter (23%) of respondents reported offering independent research. A maximum of 33% programs utilized this strategy to promote students' learning of child development. Independent research activities were least likely to provide students opportunities to study due process (16%) and IFSP (16%).

When examining the data by program type, significant differences (based on chi-square tests) were found in the number of respondents reporting they addressed each of the identified principles and practices (see Appendix F, Table F2). Appendix F, Tables 4 through F22, contain detailed information by program type for the IDEA principles/practices and instructional method used.

Chi-square tests were conducted to determine significant differences in the use of the various IDEA principles and practices by degree type. Significant differences were found for 17 of the 19 topics (see Appendix F, Table F3). Respondents representing graduate degree programs (masters and doctorate) tended to address principles of IDEA in high percentages while associates degree programs reported addressing these topics in consistently lower numbers.

Results of analysis by Carnegie classification follow a similar pattern as the results by degree type. Respondents from specialized institutions and doctoral research universities tended to place a greater focus on IDEA principles while respondents representing associates colleges consistently reported addressing these topics in lower percentages. Chi-square tests indicated significant differences for assessment models [x^2 (4, n = 735) = 38.421, p =.000], assistive technology [x^2 (4, n = 735) = 35.693, p =.000], and child development [x^2 (4, n = 735) = 11.535, p =.021] (see Appendix F, Table F3).

When examining the data by institutional control chi-square tests found significant differences in 5 of the 19 IDEA principles. In each of these instances, public four-year institutions reported addressing the IDEA principles in greater numbers than private four-year institutions (see Appendix F, Table F3).

Analyzing the data by geographic region revealed significant differences for IFSP [x^2 (3, n = 735) = 15.396, p =.000], multi-faceted assessment [x^2 (3, n = 735) = 10.689, p =.014], and natural environments [x^2 (3, n = 735) = 12.183, p =.007]. In each of these cases, respondents in the Western region of the country were least likely to address the identified IDEA principles (see Appendix F, Table F3).

Course Allocation

Respondents were asked to list courses their programs offered with content specific to: assistive technology; families; inclusion/natural environments; research and evaluation, and team process. Overall, the respondents most often reported that their programs offered at least one course related to families (87%) and research and evaluation (74%) (see Table 11). There were significant differences for all of the program types (see Appendix G, Table G1).

Table 11. *Programs Offering Courses Focusing on Areas (n = 698)*

	Frequency of Programs	Percent of Programs	Mean # of Courses	SD
Families	605	87	2.4	2.6
Team Process	450	65	2.2	2.7
Inclusion/Natural Environments	414	59	2.2	2.3
Research & Evaluation	513	74	2.0	2.1
Assistive Technology	344	49	1.9	1.9

When examining the data by degree type, graduate programs were more likely than other types of programs to address assistive technology, inclusion/natural environments, research and evaluation, and team process. Associates programs were most likely to offer courses regarding families (see Appendix G, Table G2).

Greater percentages of respondents representing specialized institutions reported addressing assistive technology, and team process (see Appendix G, Table G2). Masters colleges and universities were most likely to report offering courses regarding inclusion/natural environments while doctoral research universities were most likely to offer courses on research and evaluation.

When examining the data by geographic region, the only significant difference was offering course content regarding families which was most frequently addressed in the Western part of the country (see Appendix G, Table G2). No significant differences were found when examining the data by institutional control.

Birth to Five Opportunities

Respondents were asked to identify the types of experiences their programs used to provide students with opportunities to work with or to learn about children between birth and five years of age. The overall results suggest that students are most likely to learn about this age group through service learning/volunteer experiences (67%). In addition, almost half of the respondents (47%) noted that seminars/workshops were used to inform students about issues concerning young children (Table 12).

Table 12. *Programs Offering Experiences for Students to Work with Children Birth to Five Years (n = 567)*

Type of Experience	Frequency	Percent
Service Learning or Other Volunteer Experiences	381	67
Seminars, Workshops	267	47
Competency Achievement	195	34
Non-credit Courses	47	8
Other	113	20

Significant differences were found in each of the birth to five learning opportunity categories when examining the data by program type (see Appendix H, Table H1). Service learning/volunteer experiences were most likely to be found in occupational therapy (97%) and recreation therapy (93%). Three-quarters of early intervention (78%), family therapy (75%), and counseling (70%) provided seminars/workshops. Early childhood special education (63%) and early intervention (56%) were most likely to use competency achievement. About one-half of family therapy (50%), and education of the visually impaired (43%) offered non-credit courses.

Based on chi-square tests, graduate programs were found to be significantly more likely to use competency achievement (doctorate = 45%; masters = 40%), and seminars/workshops (doctorate = 52%; masters = 63%) to teach students about children aged birth to five years (see Appendix H, Table H2). Service learning/volunteer experiences were most likely to be offered in undergraduate programs (78%) and least likely to be offered in associates programs (51%).

Similar to the findings based on degree type, results from chi-square tests based on Carnegie classifications revealed that doctoral research universities and masters colleges and universities offered seminars/workshops in higher percentages than other classifications (see Appendix H, Table H2). Service learning/volunteer experiences appear to be more abundant in baccalaureate colleges and least available in associates colleges.

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.

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

❑ 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 <u>admit students</u> to the program you are describing in this survey?

   <u>Check all that apply</u>
   - ❑ Completion of speech/language assessment
   - ❑ GPA (Select minimum GPA required)
       - ❑ No Minimum
       - ❑ Less than 2.0
       - ❑ 2.0-2.4
       - ❑ 2.5-2.9
       - ❑ 3.0-3.4
       - ❑ Higher than 3.5
   - ❑ Past experience related to professional program
   - ❑ Results of hearing screening test
   - ❑ Results of interview with student
   - ❑ Review of preadmission portfolio
   - ❑ Review of recommendation/reference letters
   - ❑ Review of writing sample
   - ❑ Scores from standardized tests
       - ❑ Minimum ACT score_____
       - ❑ Minimum SAT score_____
       - ❑ Minimum PPST (PRAXIS) reading scores_____
       - ❑ Minimum PPST (PRAXIS) writing scores_____
       - ❑ Minimum PPST (PRAXIS) math scores_____
       - ❑ Other (please describe): _____
   - ❑ Statement of student's professional goals
   - ❑ Other (please describe):

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

   _____ % American Indian and Alaskan Native
   _____ % Asian or Pacific Islander
   _____ % Black non-Hispanic
   _____ % Hispanic
   _____ % White

9.   Please estimate the percent of students currently in the program for <u>each</u> 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.

<u>Check all that apply</u>
- ❑ 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 <u>specific groups</u> of students (e.g., students from underrepresented groups; practicing professionals) into the personnel preparation program.

<u>Check all that apply and identify the target audience</u>

	Target Audience
❑ 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	_____

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 <u>admitted</u> 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 <u>enrolled</u> 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 <u>Lower Division</u> (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 <u>Upper Division</u> (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 <u>financial support</u> 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:

_____

_____

<div style="background:#e0e0e0">ALIGNMENT WITH LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS</div>

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 <u>specifically</u> 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 <u>initial</u> 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 <u>first</u> approved by the state?
_____

23. In what year did the licensure or certification associated with the program <u>most recently</u> receive state approval? _____

SPECIALTY PERSONNEL STANDARDS

24a. Is the program accredited?

❑ Yes

    By what accrediting agency(ies)? _____

❑ No

24b. Is the program <u>pending</u> accreditation?

❑ Yes

    By what accrediting agency(ies)? _____

❑ No

25. Is the program aligned with <u>state license or certification standards for professional preparation</u>?

❑ Yes
❑ No
❑ Not sure
❑ Not applicable

26. Is the program aligned with <u>national specialty professional standards</u> (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
	❑	❑	❑	❑
	❑	❑	❑	❑
	❑	❑	❑	❑
	❑	❑	❑	❑

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 <u>core</u> 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 <u>all</u> of the boxes below that describe the <u>roles</u> 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 <u>all</u> of the boxes below that describe <u>the settings</u> 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 <u>academic credits</u> must students complete to <u>finish the program of study (not the degree program)</u>? *(Please enter numeric value.)*

   _____ Academic credits are needed to complete program

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

   _____ Credits associated with coursework

39. How many credits are associated with any type of <u>field experience or practicum</u>? *(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	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Assistive technology	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Child development	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Child focused interventions	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Cultural and linguistic sensitivity	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Due process	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Family-centered practices	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Family involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Individualized Educational Program (IEP)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Instructional planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Learning environments	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Multi-faceted assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Natural environments	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Professional and ethical practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Teaming process	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Zero rejection	☐	☐	☐	☐	

FIELD EXPERIENCES

43.   Does the program require <u>mandatory</u> field hours that focus on working with young children <u>with special needs between the ages of birth and five years</u>?

❑   Yes
❑   No (skip to question 45)
❑   Not sure (skip to question 45)
❑   Not applicable

44.   What are the <u>number of clock hours and credit hours</u> associated with <u>mandatory</u> fieldwork related to young children with special needs between the ages of birth and five?

_____ Clock hours
_____ Credit hours

45.   Does the program offer <u>optional</u> 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 <u>all</u> of the boxes below that describe the <u>field experience settings</u> for the program.

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

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

Course Practicum - a component of a credit course that requires students to complete work or make observations in the field.
Practicum - an independent, supervised, practical application of discipline content for credit.

Using the chart below, please describe:

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

Please select the academic calendar term your program is based on:

❑ Quarter   ❑ Semester

❑ Trimester   ❑ Years

❑ Other (please describe)_____

Please indicate the total number of terms the program consists of: _____

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

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

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

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.

❑ Faculty members   ____Clock hours ____Credit hours
❑ Clinical supervisors employed by the institution   ____Clock hours ____Credit hours
❑ Clinical supervisors not employed by the institution   ____Clock hours ____Credit hours
❑ Other (please describe): _____   ____Clock hours ____Credit hours

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION

52. Does the program collaborate with other programs <u>outside</u> 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:

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

54.   Below please find examples of <u>cross-disciplinary features of programs</u>. Please check <u>any</u> 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 <u>evaluate the quality of their personnel preparation program</u>. Please put a check next to <u>each box</u> 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 <u>full-time students following the recommended schedule</u> to complete the program? *(Please enter numeric value.)*   _____ years

57.   What percent of students <u>admitted</u> to the program <u>finish</u> it? _____%

58.   Does the state require that beginning professionals complete an <u>induction year</u> experience?

      ❑   Yes
      ❑   No
      ❑   Not sure

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

      ❑   Yes
      ❑   No
      ❑   Not sure

         If yes, please describe that role:

      _____

      _____

60.   What percent of students <u>find jobs in their field</u> 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 <u>where</u> students find jobs after they graduate:

      ❑   Most graduates of the program are employed <u>within the</u> assigned geographic region that the institution serves
      ❑   Most graduates of the program are employed <u>outside of</u> 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	189	2
Alaska	12	4	33	Less than 1
Arizona	72	22	301	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	Less than 1
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	2
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	Less than 1
Nebraska	64	13	20	1
Nevada	18	4	22	Less than 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	Less than 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	21	2
Wyoming	14	5	36	Less than 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

Table D1. *Instructional Delivery Methods by Program.*

	On-campus courses	Off-campus courses	Web-supported courses	Online courses	Instructional television	Part of weekend college	Through intensive institutes	Through correspondence courses	Other
Audiology (n=2)	100 (2)	0 (0)	50 (1)	0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Counseling (n=34)	100 (34)	32 (11)	29 (10)	29 (10)	6 (2)	15 (5)	21 (7)	0 (0)	6 (2)
Early Childhood Education (n=92)	96 (88)	34 (31)	26 (24)	23 (21)	8 (7)	13 (12)	7 (6)	2 (2)	9 (8)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=32)	91 (29)	38 (12)	41 (13)	19 (6)	9 (3)	9 (3)	19 (6)	0 (0)	6 (2)
Early Intervention (n=10)	70 (7)	20 (2)	50 (5)	40 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (2)	0 (0)	10 (1)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=8)	100 (8)	25 (2)	38 (3)	25 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=6)	100 (6)	33 (2)	17 (1)	50 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (1)	0 (0)	17 (1)
Family Therapy (n=5)	80 (4)	20 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Nursing (n=174)	94 (164)	20 (35)	35 (61)	22 (38)	8 (14)	5 (9)	5 (8)	1 (2)	5 (8)
Nutrition (n=17)	82 (14)	24 (4)	24 (4)	24 (4)	12 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=38)	97 (37)	37 (14)	50 (19)	26 (10)	0 (0)	5 (2)	3 (1)	3 (1)	5 (2)
Physical Therapy (n=33)	97 (32)	39 (13)	21 (7)	12 (4)	3 (1)	6 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1)
Psychology (n=69)	96 (66)	20 (14)	19 (13)	16 (11)	6 (4)	7 (5)	4 (3)	4 (3)	0 (0)
Recreation Therapy (n=15)	100 (15)	20 (3)	33 (5)	27 (4)	13 (2)	13 (2)	7 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Social Work (n=42)	98 (41)	29 (12)	38 (16)	17 (7)	14 (6)	19 (8)	10 (4)	2 (1)	0 (0)
Special Education (n=60)	92 (55)	25. (15)	47 (28)	38 (23)	8 (5)	13 (8)	17 (10)	2 (1)	2 (1)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=36)	97 (35)	36 (13)	36 (13)	11 (4)	0 (0)	3 (1)	11 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Blended Program (n=31)	90 (28)	39 (12)	52 (16)	29 (9)	19 (6)	19 (6)	16 (5)	7 (2)	3 (1)
Other Program (n=24)	100 (24)	29 (7)	25 (6)	17 (4)	8 (2)	8 (2)	8 (2)	0 (0)	13 (3)
Total (n=728)	**95 (689)***	**28 (203)**	**34 (245)***	**23 (164)**	**7 (54)**	**9 (65)**	**9 (62)***	**2 (12)**	**4 (30)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table D2. *Instructional Delivery Methods by Subgroup.*

Sub-Group	On-campus courses	Off-campus courses	Web-supported courses	Online courses	Instructional television	Part of weekend college	Through intensive institutes	Through correspondence courses	Other
Degree Type									
Associates (n=137)	96 (132)	26 (35)	25 (34)	31 (42)	10 (13)	7 (10)	4 (5)	2 (3)	5 (7)
Undergraduate (n=251)	98 (238)	26 (66)	38 (96)	21 (53)	7 (18)	8 (20)	6 (14)	2 (5)	3 (7)
Masters (n=206)	93 (192)	32 (65)	38 (78)	21 (44)	6 (12)	12 (24)	15 (30)	2 (4)	6 (12)
Doctorate (n=32)	100 (32)	34 (11)	9 (3)	13 (4)	3 (1)	3 (1)	6 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Multiple Degrees (n=69)	91 (63)	26 (18)	35 (24)	22 (15)	15 (10)	7 (5)	12 (8)	0 (0)	4 (3)
Other (n=25)	96 (24)	24 (6)	32 (8)	16 (4)	0 (0)	8 (2)	8 (2)	0 (0)	4 (1)
Total (n=720)	**95 (681)**	**28 (201)**	**34 (243)***	**23 (162)**	**8 (54)**	**9 (62)**	**9 (61)***	**2 (12)**	**4 (30)**
Carnegie Classification									
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=220)	93 (205)	30 (66)	37 (81)	21 (46)	9(19)	6 (12)	6 (14)	3 (7)	3 (6)
Masters Colleges and Universities (n=248)	96 (238)	31 (77)	39 (97)	22 (55)	8 (19)	13 (31)	1 (31)	2 (2)	4 (11)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=92)	96 (88)	16 (15)	26 (24)	14 (13)	5 (5)	11 (10)	7 (6)	1 (1)	2 (2)
Associates Colleges (n=137)	96 (131)	27 (37)	26 (35)	31 (43)	8 (11)	8 (11)	6 (8)	2 (2)	5 (7)
Specialized Institutions (n=31)	87(27)	26 (8)	26 (8)	23 (7)	0 (0)	3 (1)	10 (3)	0 (0)	13 (4)
Total (n=728)	**95 (689)**	**28 (203)**	**34 (245)***	**23 (164)***	**7 (54)**	**9 (65)**	**9 (62)**	**2 (12)**	**4 (30)**
Institutional Control									
Public, 4 year or above (n=381)	94 (359)	32 (121)	42 (158)	25 (95)	10 (39)	8 (32)	11 (41)	2 (8)	4 (15)
Private, 4 year or above (n=214)	94 (202)	22 (47)	26 (55)	14 (29)	2 (4)	11 (24)	7 (15)	1 (2)	4 (9)
Total (n=595)	**94 (561)**	**28 (168)***	**36 (213)***	**21 (124)***	**7 (43)***	**9 (56)**	**9 (56)**	**2 (10)**	**4.0 (24)**
Region									
Northeast (n=205)	97 (198)	27 (55)	25 (51)	15 (30)	2 (5)	11 (23)	11 (22)	0 (0)	4 (8)
Southeast (n=182)	93 (169)	33 (60)	40 (72)	26 (48)	8 (14)	7 (13)	6 (10)	1 (1)	3 (5)
Midwest (n=229)	94 (216)	26 (59)	36 (83)	25 (57)	10 (22)	8 (19)	9 (20)	3 (6)	6 (13)
West (n=112)	95 (106)	26 (29)	35 (39)	26 (29)	11 (13)	9 (10)	9 (10)	5 (5)	4 (4)
Total (n=728)	**95 (689)**	**28 (203)**	**34 (245)***	**23 (164)***	**7 (54)***	**9 (65)**	**9 (62)**	**2 (12)***	**4 (30)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E1. *Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration by Program.*

	Audiology	Education of the Visually Impaired	Physical Therapy	Counseling	Family Therapy	Psychology	Early Childhood Education	Nursing
Audiology (n=1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	100 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Counseling (n=21)	5 (1)	5 (1)	5 (1)	48 (10)	43 (9)	67 (14)	19 (4)	24 (5)
Early Childhood Education (n=46)	11 (5)	2 (1)	0 (0)	15 (7)	13 (6)	41 (19)	44 (20)	11 (5)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=21)	14 (3)	5 (1)	10 (2)	14 (3)	5 (1)	29 (6)	62 (13)	5 (1)
Early Intervention (n=7)	29 (2)	29 (2)	43 (3)	43 (3)	43 (3)	86 (6)	14 (1)	43 (3)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=6)	67 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (1)	0 (0)	17 (1)	50 (3)	0 (0)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=5)	60 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (1)	0 (0)
Family Therapy (n=4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (2)	50 (2)	50 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Nursing (n=65)	12 (8)	6 (4)	37 (24)	23 (15)	12 (8)	45 (29)	38.5 (25)	31 (20)
Nutrition (n=8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (2)	25 (2)	13 (1)	25 (2)	0.0 (0)	75 (6)
Occupational Therapy (n=27)	15 (4)	7 (2)	67 (18)	11 (3)	11 (3)	44 (12)	26 (7)	37 (10)
Physical Therapy (n=19)	21 (4)	5 (1)	5 (1)	11 (2)	0 (0)	26 (5)	11 (2)	32 (6)
Psychology (n=27)	11 (4)	5 (2)	11 (4)	49 (18)	14 (5)	30 (11)	38 (14)	19 (7)
Recreation Therapy (n=12)	17 (2)	0 (0)	8 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	42 (5)	17 (2)	0 (0)
Social Work (n=25)	12 (3)	8 (2)	16 (4)	36 (9)	28 (7)	40 (10)	24 (6)	36 (9)
Special Education (n=28)	18 (5)	18 (5)	14 (4)	21 (6)	7 (2)	32 (9)	46 (13)	7 (2)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=26)	58 (15)	4 (1)	19 (5)	19 (5)	15 (4)	54 (14)	46 (12)	23 (6)
Blended Program (n=24)	13 (3)	13 (3)	17 (4)	8 (2)	8 (2)	33 (8)	54 (13)	17 (4)
Other Program (n=17)	24 (4)	18 (3)	18 (3)	6 (1)	6 (1)	65 (11)	18 (3)	18 (3)
Total (n=399)	18 (70)*	7 (28)	19 (76)*	22 (89)*	14 (54)*	41 (165)*	35 (139)*	22 (87)*

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E1. *Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration by Program. (cont)*

	Recreation Therapy	ECSE	Nutrition	Rehabilitation Counseling	Early Intervention	Occupational Therapy	Social Work	Education of the Hearing Impaired
Audiology (n=1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Counseling (n=21)	5 (1)	19 (4)	5 (1)	24 (5)	10 (2)	5 (1)	29 (6)	5 (1)
Early Childhood Education (n=46)	7 (3)	44 (20)	17 (8)	0 (0)	26 (12)	11 (5)	17 (8)	9 (4)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=21)	0 (0)	48 (10)	0 (0)	10 (2)	38 (8)	14 (3)	14 (3)	14 (3)
Early Intervention (n=7)	29 (2)	57 (4)	14 (1)	43 (3)	71 (5)	14 (1)	14 (1)	43 (3)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=6)	0 (0)	33 (2)	0 (0)	33 (2)	0 (0)	17 (1)	0 (0)	17 (1)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=5)	0 (0)	60 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	60 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Family Therapy (n=4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	100 (4)	0 (0)
Nursing (n=65)	15 (10)	22 (14)	42 (27)	15 (10)	22 (14)	26 (17)	40 (26)	8 (5)
Nutrition (n=8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	38 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	38 (3)	13 (1)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=27)	19 (5)	37 (10)	7 (2)	11 (3)	26 (7)	22 (6)	19 (5)	15 (4)
Physical Therapy (n=19)	32 (6)	21 (4)	16 (3)	11 (2)	21 (4)	68 (13)	42 (8)	5 (1)
Psychology (n=27)	8 (3)	30 (11)	5 (2)	5 (2)	19 (7)	14 (5)	19 (7)	14 (5)
Recreation Therapy (n=12)	50 (6)	25 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Social Work (n=25)	8 (2)	32 (8)	16 (4)	8 (2)	20 (5)	8 (2)	12 (3)	16 (4)
Special Education (n=28)	21 (6)	39 (11)	4 (1)	11 (3)	18 (5)	14 (4)	14 (4)	21 (6)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=26)	8 (2)	77 (20)	19 (5)	15 (4)	54 (14)	31 (8)	19 (5)	27 (7)
Blended Program (n=24)	13 (3)	13 (3)	8 (2)	4 (1)	21 (5)	17 (4)	25 (6)	21 (5)
Other Program (n=17)	12 (2)	35 (6)	12 (2)	0 (0)	35 (6)	18 (3)	12 (2)	18 (3)
Total (n=399)	**13 (51)***	**33 (133)***	**15 (61)***	**10 (40)***	**24 (97)***	**19 (77)***	**22 (89)***	**13 (52)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E1. *Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration by Program. (cont)*

	Orientation and Mobility	General Special Education	Pediatrics	Speech & Language Pathology	Collaborate with Blended Program	Collaborate with Other Program
Audiology (n=1)	0 (0)	100 (1)	0 (0)	100 (1)	0 (0)	100 (1)
Counseling (n=21)	0 (0)	48 (10)	5 (1)	10 (2)	5 (1)	10 (2)
Early Childhood Education (n=46)	0 (0)	44 (20)	2 (1)	28 (13)	4 (2)	15 (7)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=21)	0 (0)	33 (7)	10 (2)	24 (5)	0 (0)	14 (3)
Early Intervention (n=7)	0 (0)	71 (5)	29 (2)	43 (3)	0 (0)	14 (1)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=6)	0 (0)	33 (2)	0 (0)	67 (4)	0 (0)	33 (2)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=5)	20 (1)	20 (1)	0 (0)	40 (2)	0 (0)	20 (1)
Family Therapy (n=4)	0 (0)	25 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (1)	0 (0)
Nursing (n=65)	6 (4)	15 (10)	59 (38)	17 (11)	2 (1)	15 (10)
Nutrition (n=8)	0 (0)	13 (1)	13 (1)	13 (1)	0 (0)	25 (2)
Occupational Therapy (n=27)	7 (2)	30 (8)	22 (6)	48 (13)	0 (0)	11 (3)
Physical Therapy (n=19)	5 (1)	21 (4)	26 (5)	42 (8)	0 (0)	26 (5)
Psychology (n=27)	3 (1)	43 (16)	19 (7)	11 (4)	3 (1)	8 (3)
Recreation Therapy (n=12)	0 (0)	42 (5)	0 (0)	17 (2)	0 (0)	25 (3)
Social Work (n=25)	8 (2)	28 (7)	20 (5)	24 (6)	0 (0)	24 (6)
Special Education (n=28)	4 (1)	57 (16)	7 (2)	36 (10)	14 (4)	25 (7)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=26)	0 (0)	69 (18)	23 (6)	12 (3)	4 (1)	0 (0)
Blended Program (n=24)	0 (0)	29 (7)	13 (3)	29 (7)	38 (9)	8 (2)
Other Program (n=17)	0 (0)	53 (9)	6 (1)	47 (8)	6 (1)	29 (5)
Total (n=399)	**3 (12)**	**37 (148)***	**20 (80)***	**26 (103)***	**5 (21)***	**16 (63)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E2. *Cross-Disciplinary Features by Program.*

	Courses offered and listed jointly within	Courses offered and listed jointly across	Courses are team taught	Student enrollment different disciplines	Courses are taken with students from different disciplines
Audiology (n=1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	100 (1)	0 (0)	100 (1)
Counseling (n=21)	38 (8)	33 (7)	14 (3)	29 (6)	76 (16)
Early Childhood Education (n=46)	46 (21)	30 (14)	39 (18)	44 (20)	74 (34)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=21)	48 (10)	38 (8)	24 (5)	57 (12)	71 (15)
Early Intervention (n=7)	86 (6)	43 (3)	57 (4)	100 (7)	100 (7)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=6)	0 (0)	18 (1)	67 (4)	67 (4)	100 (6)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=5)	0 (0)	20 (1)	20 (1)	60 (3)	80 (4)
Family Therapy (n=4)	50 (2)	50 (2)	75 (3)	50 (2)	75 (3)
Nursing (n=65)	28 (18)	12 (8)	26 (17)	12 (8)	32 (21)
Nutrition (n=8)	13 (1)	13 (1)	25 (2)	13 (1)	88 (7)
Occupational Therapy (n=27)	48 (13)	30 (8)	63 (17)	44 (12)	78 (21)
Physical Therapy (n=19)	21 (4)	21 (4)	58 (11)	32 (6)	47 (9)
Psychology (n=27)	43 (16)	27 (10)	32 (12)	35 (13)	65 (24)
Recreation Therapy (n=12)	50 (6)	25 (3)	17 (2)	33 (4)	92 (11)
Social Work (n=25)	40 (10)	40 (10)	36 (9)	28 (7)	68 (17)
Special Education (n=28)	46 (13)	29 (8)	43 (12)	46 (13)	71 (20)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=26)	39 (10)	23 (6)	42 (11)	54 (14)	79 (20)
Blended Program (n=24)	58 (14)	25 (6)	38 (9)	54 (13)	71 (17)
Other Program (n=17)	29 (5)	29 (5)	35 (6)	41 (7)	88 (15)
Total (n=399)	**39 (157)***	**26 (105)**	**37 (147)***	**38 (152)***	**67 (268)***

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E2. *Cross-Disciplinary Features by Program. (cont)*

	Practicum experiences are supervised	Student placement	Students complete field experience together	Steering committee members	Other
Audiology (n=1)	100 (1)	100 (1)	100 (1)	100 (1)	0 (0)
Counseling (n=21)	10 (2)	14 (3)	19 (4)	29 (6)	10 (2)
Early Childhood Education (n=46)	17 (8)	26 (12)	30 (14)	30 (14)	11 (5)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=21)	24 (5)	33 (7)	19 (4)	29 (6)	5 (1)
Early Intervention (n=7)	86 (6)	57 (4)	71 (5)	57 (4)	14 (1)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=6)	17 (1)	0 (0)	17 (1)	33 (2)	17 (1)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=5)	40 (2)	20 (1)	20 (1)	20 (1)	20 (1)
Family Therapy (n=4)	50 (2)	0 (0)	75 (3)	25 (1)	25 (1)
Nursing (n=65)	19 (12)	48 (31)	17 (11)	23 (15)	5 (3)
Nutrition (n=8)	38 (3)	25 (2)	25 (2)	38 (3)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=27)	74 (20)	63 (17)	52 (14)	19 (5)	19 (5)
Physical Therapy (n=19)	16 (3)	16 (3)	26 (5)	21 (4)	21 (4)
Psychology (n=27)	41 (15)	38 (14)	32 (12)	16 (6)	5 (2)
Recreation Therapy (n=12)	8 (1)	33 (4)	25 (3)	25 (3)	33 (4)
Social Work (n=25)	32 (8)	36 (9)	40 (10)	28 (7)	4 (1)
Special Education (n=28)	32 (9)	14 (4)	46 (13)	39 (11)	4 (1)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=26)	19 (5)	31 (8)	31 (8)	12 (3)	8 (2)
Blended Program (n=24)	25 (6)	38 (9)	42 (10)	38 (9)	29 (7)
Other Program (n=17)	18 (3)	12 (2)	29 (5)	53 (9)	18 (3)
Total (n=399)	**28 (112)***	**33 (131)***	**32 (126)***	**28 (110)**	**11 (44)***

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E3. *Cross-Disciplinary Features by Subgroup.*

Sub-Group	Courses offered and listed jointly within	Courses offered and listed jointly across	Courses are team taught	Student enrollment different disciplines	Courses are taken with students from different disciplines
Degree Type					
Associates (n=47)	28 (13)	11 (5)	28 (13)	19 (9)	40 (19)
Undergraduate (n=122)	40 (49)	30 (36)	37 (45)	36.1 (44)	71 (86)
Masters (n=141)	42 (59)	30 (42)	38 (53)	50 (70)	77 (108)
Doctorate (n=21)	43 (9)	29 (6)	52 (11)	29 (6)	62 (13)
Multiple Degrees (n=47)	38 (18)	26 (12)	40 (19)	36 (17)	60 (28)
Other (n=17)	35 (6)	18 (3)	29 (5)	24 (4)	71 (12)
Total (n=395)	**39 (154)**	**26 (104)**	**37 (146)**	**38 (150)***	**67 (266)***
Carnegie Classification					
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=139)	35 (49)	30 (41)	40 (55)	46 (64)	76 (106)
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=148)	43 (64)	34 (50)	34 (50)	39 (57)	72 (106)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=39)	46 (18)	23 (9)	41 (16)	39 (15)	64 (25)
Associates Colleges (n=51)	31 (16)	8 (4)	26 (13)	18 (9)	31 (16)
Specialized Institutions (n=22)	46 (10)	5 (1)	59 (13)	32 (7)	68 (15)
Total (n=399)	**39 (157)**	**26 (105)***	**37 (147)**	**38 (152)***	**67 (268)***
Institutional Control					
Public, 4 year or above (n=226)	38 (85)	30 (67)	34 (76)	41 (93)	75 (169)
Private, 4 year or above (n=124)	46 (57)	27 (34)	46 (57)	40 (49)	65 (81)
Total (n=350)	**41 (142)**	**29 (101)**	**38 (133)***	**41 (142)**	**71 (250)**
Region					
Northeast (n=122)	41 (46)	24 (27)	41 (46)	37 (42)	67 (75)
Southeast (n=96)	27 (16)	25 (24)	40 (38)	32 (31)	68 (65)
Midwest (n=133)	43 (57)	31 (41)	34 (45)	43 (57)	69 (92)
West (n=58)	48 (28)	22 (13)	31 (18)	38 (22)	62 (36)
Total (n=399)	**39 (157)***	**26 (105)**	**37 (147)**	**38 (152)**	**67 (268)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table E3. *Cross-Disciplinary Features by Subgroup. (cont)*

Sub-Group	Practicum experiences are supervised	Student placement	Students complete field experience together	Steering committee members	Other
Degree Type					
Associates (n=47)	11 (5)	38 (18)	11 (5)	28 (13)	4 (2)
Undergraduate (n=122)	25 (31)	34 (41)	32 (39)	25 (30)	10 (12)
Masters (n=141)	38 (53)	31 (44)	33 (47)	29 (41)	11 (15)
Doctorate (n=21)	29 (6)	19 (4)	33 (7)	24 (5)	14 (3)
Multiple Degrees (n=47)	19 (9)	38 (18)	40 (19)	30 (14)	13 (6)
Other (n=17)	47 (8)	35 (6)	41 (7)	41 (7)	29 (5)
Total (n=395)	**28 (112)***	**33 (131)**	**31 (124)***	**28 (110)**	**11 (43)**
Carnegie Classification					
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=139)	35 (49)	34 (48)	45 (62)	33 (46)	7 (10)
Masters Colleges & Universities (n=148)	28 (41)	31 (46)	28 (41)	25 (37)	14 (21)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=39)	18 (7)	28 (11)	28 (11)	15 (6)	21 (8)
Associates Colleges (n=51)	12 (6)	35 (18)	12 (6)	25 (13)	4 (2)
Specialized Institutions (n=22)	41 (9)	36 (8)	27 (6)	36 (8)	14 (3)
Total (n=399)	**28 (112)***	**33 (131)**	**32 (126)***	**28 (110)**	**11 (44)***
Institutional Control					
Public, 4 year or above (n=226)	31 (70)	35 (80)	39 (89)	32 (72)	13 (30)
Private, 4 year or above (n=124)	29 (36)	26 (32)	24 (30)	19 (24)	10 (12)
Total (n=350)	**30 (106)**	**32 (112)**	**34 (119)***	**27 (96)***	**12 (42)**
Region					
Northeast (n=122)	27 (30)	30 (33)	24 (27)	20 (22)	14 (16)
Southeast (n=96)	22 (21)	30 (29)	32 (31)	29 (28)	10 (10)
Midwest (n=133)	29 (39)	29 (38)	32 (43)	31 (41)	12 (16)
West (n=58)	38 (22)	53 (31)	43 (25)	33 (19)	3 (2)
Total (n=399)	**28 (112)**	**32 (131)***	**32 (126)**	**28 (110)**	**11 (44)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F1. *Percent* and Frequency of Programs Addressing Principles and Practices of IDEA (n =735)*

Principles and Practices	Independent Research %(Frequency)	Class Lecture % (Frequency)	In-Class Simulation % (Frequency)	Field Experience % (Frequency)
Assessment models (n=644) 88%	24 (153)	95 (610)	58 (375)	78 (499)
Assistive technology (n=533) 73%	24 (125)	83 (443)	53 (283)	67 (358)
Child development (n=710) 97%	33 (232)	98 (692)	46 (323)	79 (560)
Child focused interventions (n=666) 91%	29 (196)	94 (627)	57 (381)	85 (569)
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity (n=671) 91%	28 (186)	97 (651)	51 (344)	81 (542)
Due process (n=586) 80%	16 (91)	95 (558)	26 (152)	44 (259)
Family-centered practices (n=654) 90%	26 (170)	98 (638)	52.3 (342)	79.5 (520)
Family involvement (n=676) 92%	24 (160)	95 (645)	47.8 (323)	79 (536)
Free Appropriate Public Education (n=495) 67%	19 (94)	92 (457)	25.9 (128)	52 (259)
IEP (n=558) 76%	19 (103)	94 (523)	48 (266)	72 (399)
IFSP (n=515) 70%	16 (82)	90.3 (465)	39.6 (204)	62 (320)
Instructional planning (n=535) 73%	27 (144)	91.2 (488)	58 (309)	79 (424)
Learning environments (n=583) 79%	25 (143)	92 (538)	51 (295)	78 (454)
Least Restrictive Environment (n=550) 75%	17 (93)	94 (517)	33 (182)	69 (381)
Multi-faceted assessment (n=551) 75%	24 (131)	96 (526)	54 (300)	73 (401)
Natural environments (n=512) 70%	21 (108)	91 (466)	37 (189)	75 (385)
Professional and ethical practice (n=673) 92%	22 (150)	97 (655)	54 (363)	75 (505)
Teaming process (n=575) 78%	20 (116)	93 (536)	60 (344)	82 (471)
Zero rejection (n=376) 51%	18 (67)	86 (325)	25 (92)	48 (182)
Overall	**23**	**93**	**46**	**72**

*Percent within Princ/Pract.

Table F2. *IDEA by Program.*

	Assessment Models	Assistive Technology	Child Development	Child Focused Interventions	Cultural and Linguistic Sensitivity	Due Process	Family-Centered Practices
Audiology (n=2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)
Counseling (n=35)	80 (28)	43 (15)	100 (35)	94 (33)	94 (33)	83 (29)	86 (30)
Early Childhood Education (n=96)	96 (92)	83 (80)	100 (96)	88 (84)	96 (92)	83 (80)	94 (90)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=36)	100 (36)	97 (35)	100 (36)	97 (35)	100 (36)	100 (36)	97 (35)
Early Intervention (n=9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=8)	100 (8)	88 (7)	88 (7)	88 (7)	88 (7)	88 (7)	88 (7)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	86 (6)	86 (6)	100 (7)	100 (7)	100 (7)	86 (6)	100 (7)
Family Therapy (n=4)	75 (3)	0 (0)	100 (4)	100 (4)	75 (3)	100 (4)	100 (4)
Nursing (n=163)	68 (111)	48 (78)	93. (152)	83 (135)	82 (134)	52 (85)	87 (141)
Nutrition (n=12)	58 (7)	42 (5)	67 (8)	42 (5)	58 (7)	50 (6)	50 (6)
Occupational Therapy (n=41)	100 (41)	100 (41)	100 (41)	100 (41)	100 (41)	100 (41)	100 (41)
Physical Therapy (n=35)	94 (33)	91 (32)	100 (35)	100 (35)	97 (34)	89 (31)	97 (34)
Psychology (n=74)	92 (68)	57 (42)	99 (73)	89 (66)	88 (65)	73 (54)	76 (56)
Recreation Therapy (n=14)	100 (14)	100 (14)	100 (14)	100 (14)	93 (13)	100 (14)	93 (13)
Social Work (n=41)	85 (35)	49 (20)	95 (39)	90 (37)	90 (37)	78 (32)	93 (38)
Special Education (n=61)	97 (59)	93 (57)	97 (59)	97 (59)	97 (59)	98 (60)	97 (59)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=40)	100 (40)	100 (40)	100 (40)	100 (40)	100 (40)	98 (39)	95 (38)
Blended Program (n=31)	97 (30)	94 (29)	97 (30)	97 (30)	97 (30)	94 (29)	94 (29)
Other Program (n=26)	85 (22)	81 (21)	89 (23)	89 (23)	85 (22)	85 (22)	81 (21)
Total (n=735)	**88 (644)***	**73 (533)***	**97 (710)***	**91 (666)***	**91 (671)***	**80 (586)***	**90 (660)***

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F2. *IDEA by Program.(cont)*

	Family Involvement	FAPE	IEP	IFSP	Instructional Planning	Learning Environments
Audiology (n=2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)
Counseling (n=35)	94 (33)	63 (22)	89 (31)	63 (22)	69 (24)	69 (24)
Early Childhood Education (n=96)	98 (94)	81 (78)	95 (91)	91 (87)	98 (94)	99 (95)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=36)	97 (35)	97 (35)	100 (36)	97 (35)	100 (36)	100 (36)
Early Intervention (n=9)	89 (8)	100 (9)	100 (9)	89 (8)	100 (9)	100 (9)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=8)	75 (6)	88 (7)	88 (7)	75 (6)	100 (8)	88 (7)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	100 (7)	100 (7)	100 (7)	100 (7)	100 (7)	100 (7)
Family Therapy (n=4)	100 (4)	25 (1)	25 (1)	75 (3)	0 (0)	75 (3)
Nursing (n=163)	87 (142)	26 (42)	34 (56)	26 (43)	38 (62)	54 (88)
Nutrition (n=12)	75 (9)	8 (1)	17 (2)	17 (2)	58 (7)	50 (6)
Occupational Therapy (n=41)	100 (41)	90 (37)	100 (41)	98 (40)	83 (34)	95 (39)
Physical Therapy (n=35)	100 (35)	77 (27)	94 (33)	91 (32)	83 (29)	89 (31)
Psychology (n=74)	80 (59)	61 (45)	70 (52)	58 (43)	61 (45)	72 (53)
Recreation Therapy (n=14)	100 (14)	86 (12)	93 (13)	79 (11)	86 (12)	93 (13)
Social Work (n=41)	90 (37)	54 (22)	59 (24)	63 (26)	39 (16)	51 (21)
Special Education (n=61)	98 (60)	98 (60)	98 (60)	97 (59)	100 (61)	98 (60)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=40)	93 (37)	95 (38)	100 (40)	98 (39)	93 (37)	95 (38)
Blended Program (n=31)	97 (30)	97 (30)	94 (29)	94 (29)	94 (29)	94 (29)
Other Program (n=26)	89 (23)	77 (20)	92 (24)	81 (21)	89 (23)	85 (22)
Total (n=735)	**92 (676)***	**67 (495)***	**76 (558)***	**70 (515)***	**73 (535)***	**79 (583)***

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F2. *IDEA by Program.(cont)*

	LRE	Multi-faceted Assessment	Natural Environments	Professional and Ethical Practice	Teaming Process	Zero Rejection
Audiology (n=2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)
Counseling (n=35)	71 (25)	77 (27)	46 (16)	86 (30)	63 (22)	29 (10)
Early Childhood Education (n=96)	92 (88)	87 (83)	89 (85)	94 (90)	83 (80)	63 (60)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=36)	100 (36)	100 (36)	100 (36)	100 (36)	100 (36)	92 (33)
Early Intervention (n=9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	100 (9)	89 (8)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=8)	88 (7)	88 (7)	88 (7)	100 (8)	86 (7)	88 (7)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	86 (6)	100 (7)	100 (7)	86 (6)	100 (7)	71 (5)
Family Therapy (n=4)	25 (1)	75 (3)	25 (1)	100 (4)	25 (1)	25 (1)
Nursing (n=163)	34 (56)	43 (70)	26 (43)	83 (135)	56 (92)	21 (33)
Nutrition (n=12)	0 (0)	42 (5)	17 (2)	92 (11)	58 (7)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=41)	100 (41)	95 (39)	98 (40)	98 (40)	100 (41)	56 (23)
Physical Therapy (n=35)	91 (32)	80 (28)	86 (30)	100 (35)	89 (31)	57 (20)
Psychology (n=74)	70 (52)	65 (48)	65 (48)	84 (62)	64 (47)	40 (30)
Recreation Therapy (n=14)	100 (14)	100 (14)	93 (13)	100 (14)	93 (13)	71 (10)
Social Work (n=41)	73 (30)	73 (30)	71 (29)	90 (37)	76 (31)	27 (11)
Special Education (n=61)	98 (60)	95 (58)	93 (57)	100 (61)	100 (61)	89 (54)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=40)	98 (39)	95 (38)	88 (35)	100 (40)	98 (39)	65 (26)
Blended Program (n=31)	94 (29)	90 (28)	97 (30)	94 (29)	91 (28)	84 (26)
Other Program (n=26)	89 (23)	73 (19)	85 (22)	92 (24)	81 (21)	65 (17)
Total (n=735)	**75 (550)***	**75 (551)***	**70 (512)***	**92 (673)***	**78 (575)***	**51 (376)***

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F3. *IDEA by Subgroup.*

Sub-Group	Assessment Models	Assistive Technology	Child Development	Child Focused Interventions	Cultural and Linguistic Sensitivity	Due Process	Family-Centered Practices
Degree Type							
Associates (n=125)	70 (88)	50 (63)	93 (116)	79.2 (99)	82.4 (103)	56 (70)	82 (102)
Undergraduate (n=252)	88 (221)	75 (188)	98 (246)	89.7 (226)	90.5 (228)	81 (203)	90 (227)
Masters (n=222)	93 (206)	78 (172)	98 (217)	95.9 (213)	94.6 (210)	89 (197)	93 (206)
Doctorate (n=35)	97 (34)	74 (26)	97 (34)	100.0 (35)	94.3 (33)	83 (29)	97 (34)
Multiple Degrees (n=67)	96 (64)	85 (57)	97 (65)	92.5 (62)	97.0 (65)	91 (61)	90 (60)
Other (n=26)	89 (23)	81 (21)	92 (24)	88.5 (23)	92.3 (24)	81 (21)	92 (24)
Total (n=727)	**88 (636)***	**73 (527)***	**97 (702)**	**90.5 (658)***	**91.2 (663)***	**80 (581)***	**90 (653)***
Carnegie Classification							
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=225)	92 (207)	80 (180)	96 (215)	92 (208)	90 (203)	87 (195)	89 (201)
Masters Colleges and Universities (n=263)	92 (243)	76 (199)	98 (257)	94 (246)	95 (251)	86 (226)	91 (239)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=89)	80 (71)	67 (60)	100 (89)	91 (81)	91 (81)	78 (69)	96 (85)
Associates Colleges (n=125)	74 (92)	52.8 (66)	93 (116)	80 (100)	82 (103)	55 (69)	83 (104)
Specialized Institutions (n=33)	94 (31)	85 (28)	100 (33)	94 (31)	100 (33)	82 (27)	94 (31)
Total (n=735)	**88 (644)***	**73 (533)***	**97 (710)***	**91 (666)***	**91 (671)***	**80 (586)***	**90 (660)***
Institutional Control							
Public, 4 year or above (n=391)	91 (356)	79 (308)	97 (379)	94 (368)	93 (364)	87 (340)	92 (358)
Private, 4 year or above (n=223)	90 (200)	73 (163)	98 (218)	90 (201)	92 (206)	81 (181)	91 (202)
Total (n=614)	**91 (556)**	**77 (471)**	**97 (597)**	**93 (569)**	**93 (570)**	**85 (521)**	**91 (560)**
Region							
Northeast (n=207)	88 (182)	74 (154)	96 (199)	90 (187)	91 (189)	83 (171)	90 (187)
Southeast (n=181)	85 (154)	70 (126)	96 (173)	87 (158)	88 (159)	75 (136)	86 (156)
Midwest (n=233)	90 (209)	76 (176)	97 (226)	93 (217)	93 (217)	81 (188)	91 (213)
West (n=114)	89 (99)	68 (77)	98 (112)	91 (104)	93 (106)	80 (91)	91 (104)
Total (n=735)	**88 (644)**	**73 (533)**	**97 (710)**	**91 (666)**	**91 (671)**	**80 (586)**	**90 (660)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F3. *IDEA by Subgroup.(cont)*

Sub-Group	Family Involvement	FAPE	IEP	IFSP	Instructional Planning	Learning Environments
Degree Type						
Associates (n=125)	87 (109)	38 (48)	46 (57)	38 (48)	44.8 (56)	62 (78)
Undergraduate (n=252)	91 (230)	66 (167)	75 (190)	68 (172)	75.4 (190)	79 (199)
Masters (n=222)	95 (210)	82 (181)	89 (198)	84 (186)	81.5 (181)	87 (193)
Doctorate (n=35)	94 (33)	71 (25)	77 (27)	83 (29)	68.6 (24)	77 (27)
Multiple Degrees (n=67)	94 (63)	76 (51)	85 (57)	81 (54)	85.1 (57)	85 (57)
Other (n=26)	92 (24)	69 (18)	85 (22)	77 (20)	80.8 (21)	85 (22)
Total (n=727)	**92 (669)**	**67 (490)***	**76 (551)***	**70 (509)***	**72.8 (529)***	**79 (576)***
Carnegie Classification						
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=225)	92 (208)	75 (169)	82 (184)	79 (178)	78.2 (176)	84 (190)
Masters Colleges and Universities (n=263)	92 (242)	76 (199)	82 (216)	77 (202)	79.8 (210)	82 (215)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=89)	94 (84)	61 (54)	80 (71)	70 (62)	73.0 (65)	82 (73)
Associates Colleges (n=125)	88 (110)	40 (50)	46 (58)	38 (47)	44.8 (56)	62 (78)
Specialized Institutions (n=33)	97 (32)	70 (23)	88 (29)	79 (26)	84.8 (28)	82 (27)
Total (n=735)	**92 (676)**	**67 (495)***	**76 (558)***	**70 (515)***	**72.8 (535)***	**79 (583)***
Institutional Control						
Public, 4 year or above (n=391)	94 (366)	77 (302)	85 (331)	79 (308)	83 (323)	85 (333)
Private, 4 year or above (n=223)	91 (203)	66 (148)	77 (172)	73 (163)	71 (159)	79 (176)
Total (n=614)	**93 (569)**	**73 (450)***	**82 (503)***	**77 (471)**	**79 (482)***	**83 (509)***
Region						
Northeast (n=207)	91 (189)	70 (144)	81 (167)	76 (157)	73 (152)	78 (162)
Southeast (n=181)	90 (163)	62 (113)	71 (129)	63 (114)	67 (121)	77 (139)
Midwest (n=233)	93 (217)	72 (167)	78 (181)	75 (175)	78 (182)	82 (191)
West (n=114)	94 (107)	62 (71)	71 (81)	61 (69)	70 (80)	80 (91)
Total (n=735)	**92 (676)**	**67 (495)**	**76 (558)**	**70 (515)***	**73 (535)**	**79 (583)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F3. *IDEA by Subgroup.(cont)*

Sub-Group	LRE	Multi-faceted Assessment	Natural Environments	Professional and Ethical Practice	Teaming Process	Zero Rejection
Degree Type						
Associates (n=125)	42 (53)	44 (55)	37 (46)	82 (103)	59 (74)	28 (35)
Undergraduate (n=252)	76 (191)	77 (195)	72 (182)	91 (230)	77 (195)	50 (127)
Masters (n=222)	87 (193)	85 (188)	81 (180)	95 (210)	85 (189)	62 (138)
Doctorate (n=35)	83 (29)	74 (26)	80 (28)	97 (34)	74 (26)	54 (19)
Multiple Degrees (n=67)	84 (56)	88 (59)	79 (53)	97 (65)	93 (62)	58 (39)
Other (n=26)	81 (21)	85 (22)	69 (18)	92 (24)	89 (23)	58 (15)
Total (n=727)	**75 (543)***	**75 (545)***	**70 (507)***	**92 (666)***	**78 (569)***	**51 (373)***
Carnegie Classification						
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=225)	81 (183)	82 (184)	77 (173)	92 (208)	8 (185)	59 (132)
Masters Colleges and Universities (n=263)	82 (215)	79 (208)	77 (202)	93 (245)	83 (219)	56 (146)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=89)	81 (72)	83 (74)	71 (63)	98 (87)	76 (68)	51 (45)
Associates Colleges (n=125)	43 (54)	46 (58)	38 (48)	81 (101)	59 (74)	28 (35)
Specialized Institutions (n=33)	79 (26)	82 (27)	79 (26)	97 (32)	88 (29)	55 (18)
Total (n=735)	**75 (550)***	**75 (551)***	**70 (512)***	**92 (673)***	**78 (575)***	**51 (376)***
Institutional Control						
Public, 4 year or above (n=391)	83 (324)	83 (324)	78 (305)	94 (368)	84 (332)	58 (227)
Private, 4 year or above (n=223)	79 (177)	78 (174)	74 (164)	92 (206)	77 (172)	53 (117)
Total (n=614)	**82 (501)**	**81 (498)**	**76 (469)**	**94 (574)**	**82 (504)***	**56 (344)**
Region						
Northeast (n=207)	79 (164)	76 (157)	73 (150)	90 (186)	78 (162)	56 (115)
Southeast (n=181)	73 (132)	73 (132)	67 (121)	91 (165)	78 (141)	45 (82)
Midwest (n=233)	76 (178)	81 (188)	75 (175)	93 (217)	81 (188)	53 (123)
West (n=114)	67 (76)	65 (74)	58 (66)	92 (105)	74 (84)	49 (56)
Total (n=735)	**75 (550)**	**75 (551)***	**70 (512)***	**92 (673)**	**78 (575)**	**51 (376)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table F4. *Instructional Strategies Used in Audiology Programs (n=2)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	50	100	100	100
Assistive technology	100	100	100	100
Child development	50	100	100	100
Child focused interventions	50	100	100	100
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	100	100	100	100
Due process	50	100	50	50
Family-centered practices	50	100	100	50
Family involvement	50	100	50	50
FAPE	50	100	50	100
IEP	50	100	100	100
IFSP	50	100	100	50
Instructional planning	100	100	50	100
Learning environments	50	100	50	100
Least Restrictive Environment	50	100	50	100
Multi-faceted assessment	50	100	50	100
Natural environments	50	100	100	100
Professional and ethical practice	50	100	50	100
Teaming process	50	100	50	100
Zero rejection	50	100	100	50

Table F5. *Instructional Strategies Used in Counseling Programs (n=35)*

	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	17	71	34	54
Assistive technology	9	37	20	23
Child development	37	100	43	77
Child focused interventions	31	94	60	86
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	31	94	60	83
Due process	17	80	31	43
Family-centered practices	14	86	51	66
Family involvement	20	94	49	69
FAPE	11	57	17	34
IEP	9	77	26	60
IFSP	3	51	17	51
Instructional planning	17	63	4	60
Learning environments	14	60	29	54
Least Restrictive Environment	6	60	20	51
Multi-faceted assessment	20	71	40	54
Natural environments	6	31	14	31
Professional and ethical practice	20	86	49	74
Teaming process	11	57	34	54
Zero rejection	6	20	11	20

Table F6.   *Instructional Strategies Used in Early Childhood Education Programs (n=96)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	17	93	55	70
Assistive technology	14	65	34	45
Child development	42	99	59	84
Child focused interventions	20	83	45	72
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	25	93	54	81
Due process	15	78	22	19
Family-centered practices	25	92	46	65
Family involvement	21	95	51	71
FAPE	13	77	20	27
IEP	15	92	38	55
IFSP	13	88	32	40
Instructional planning	26	97	66	87
Learning environments	28	98	62	83
Least Restrictive Environment	14	89	27	57
Multi-faceted assessment	20	85	42	52
Natural environments	14	83	33	63
Professional and ethical practice	19	93	52	63
Teaming process	13	80	46	56
Zero rejection	10	57	18	25

Table F7.   *Instructional Strategies Used in Early Childhood Special Education Programs (n=36)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	25	100	69	92
Assistive technology	22	86	64	61
Child development	28	92	47	75
Child focused interventions	36	89	56	86
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	39	100	64	89
Due process	14	100	28	47
Family-centered practices	42	94	61	78
Family involvement	42	89	53	89
FAPE	17	97	17	42
IEP	19	100	67	83
IFSP	22	89	61	75
Instructional planning	22	94	67	83
Learning environments	17	92	61	89
Least Restrictive Environment	17	100	39	75
Multi-faceted assessment	22	97	61	69
Natural environments	19	97	33	83
Professional and ethical practice	28	97	53	78
Teaming process	25	97	67	83
Zero rejection	8	89	28	47

Table F8. *Instructional Strategies Used in Early Intervention Programs (n=9)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	22	89	56	89
Assistive technology	33	89	56	78
Child development	11	89	56	78
Child focused interventions	22	89	56	89
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	11	89	56	78
Due process	100	89	33	56
Family-centered practices	11	89	67	78
Family involvement	11	78	56	78
FAPE	11	89	33	56
IEP	11	89	67	78
IFSP	100	78	56	56
Instructional planning	11	89	67	78
Learning environments	11	89	56	78
Least Restrictive Environment	100	89	56	67
Multi-faceted assessment	11	89	67	78
Natural environments	11	89	56	78
Professional and ethical practice	100	89	56	67
Teaming process	100	89	67	78
Zero rejection	100	78	11	22

Table F9.   *Instructional Strategies Used in Education of the Hearing Impaired Programs (n=8)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	50	88	75	75
Assistive technology	13	75	63	75
Child development	38	63	38	75
Child focused interventions	25	88	63	88
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	63	88	38	88
Due process	25	88	25	25
Family-centered practices	38	75	63	88
Family involvement	38	75	50	63
FAPE	38	88	38	50
IEP	38	75	63	50
IFSP	25	50	50	50
Instructional planning	63	100	75	100
Learning environments	25	75	63	88
Least Restrictive Environment	38	88	50	75
Multi-faceted assessment	25	88	50	75
Natural environments	25	88	25	88
Professional and ethical practice	25	100	25	75
Teaming process	13	88	50	88
Zero rejection	25	75	25	38

Table F10. *Instructional Strategies Used in Education of the Visually Impaired Programs (n=7)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	43	86	43	57
Assistive technology	43	71	57	57
Child development	43	100	29	57
Child focused interventions	57	100	29	71
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	57	100	57	86
Due process	29	86	29	43
Family-centered practices	43	100	71	57
Family involvement	43	100	57	57
FAPE	29	100	29	43
IEP	29	100	57	57
IFSP	29	100	43	57
Instructional planning	43	100	86	57
Learning environments	43	100	71	71
Least Restrictive Environment	29	86	43	57
Multi-faceted assessment	29	100	57	57
Natural environments	43	100	29	71
Professional and ethical practice	29	86	57	43
Teaming process	43	86	43	43
Zero rejection	29	71	14	43

Table F11. *Instructional Strategies Used in Family Therapy Programs (n=4)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	0	75	75	25
Assistive technology	0	0	0	0
Child development	25	100	50	75
Child focused interventions	75	75	100	100
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	75	75	50	75
Due process	0	0	0	25
Family-centered practices	75	100	100	100
Family involvement	75	100	100	100
FAPE	0	25	0	25
IEP	0	25	0	25
IFSP	0	75	0	25
Instructional planning	0	0	0	0
Learning environments	0	75	25	25
Least Restrictive Environment	0	25	0	0
Multi-faceted assessment	25	75	25	25
Natural environments	25	25	25	25
Professional and ethical practice	25	100	50	25
Teaming process	25	25	25	25
Zero rejection	0	25	0	0

Table F12. *Instructional Strategies Used in Nursing Programs (n=163)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	4	62	25	45
Assistive technology	3	36	15	33
Child development	16	91	33	72
Child focused interventions	13	79	34	70
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	10	79	27	58
Due process	3	47	7	18
Family-centered practices	15	85	33	71
Family involvement	12	83	30	70
FAPE	4	18	3	10
IEP	3	27	3	17
IFSP	3	18	1	11
Instructional planning	4	30	6	26
Learning environments	5	45	12	36
Least Restrictive Environment	3	27	5	19
Multi-faceted assessment	4	36	12	32
Natural environments	3	18	4	13
Professional and ethical practice	12	79	35	58
Teaming process	6	52	26	44
Zero rejection	2	12	3	7

Table F13. *Instructional Strategies Used in Nutrition Programs (n=12)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	8	42	25	42
Assistive technology	0	33	17	25
Child development	0	58	17	17
Child focused interventions	0	33	8	17
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	0	58	8	33
Due process	0	42	17	17
Family-centered practices	0	25	0	33
Family involvement	0	58	8	42
FAPE	0	8	0	0
IEP	0	17	0	8
IFSP	0	17	0	0
Instructional planning	0	42	25	17
Learning environments	0	42	17	25
Least Restrictive Environment	0	0	0	0
Multi-faceted assessment	0	33	17	33
Natural environments	0	8	0	8
Professional and ethical practice	0	75	17	33
Teaming process	0	50	25	33
Zero rejection	0	0	0	0

Table F14. *Instructional Strategies Used in Occupational Therapy Programs (n=42)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	42	98	76	85
Assistive technology	51	98	85	81
Child development	56	100	71	90
Child focused interventions	51	98	90	98
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	44	98	68	88
Due process	20	100	20	24
Family-centered practices	32	98	63	88
Family involvement	32	95	73	83
FAPE	27	88	29	54
IEP	24	100	63	73
IFSP	17	98	63	66
Instructional planning	29	73	63	59
Learning environments	27	90	59	63
Least Restrictive Environment	20	100	37	61
Multi-faceted assessment	22	95	63	66
Natural environments	27	93	51	81
Professional and ethical practice	34	98	76	83
Teaming process	29	100	73	83
Zero rejection	12	51	17	27

Table F15. *Instructional Strategies Used in Physical Therapy Programs (n=35)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	17	94	49	69
Assistive technology	14	86	49	71
Child development	17	97	60	91
Child focused interventions	11	94	66	86
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	17	94	46	71
Due process	6	83	17	43
Family-centered practices	11	94	46	83
Family involvement	11	94	46	91
FAPE	9	66	17	46
IEP	11	91	43	77
IFSP	9	89	37	66
Instructional planning	9	77	34	49
Learning environments	6	83	34	57
Least Restrictive Environment	11	80	20	66
Multi-faceted assessment	9	80	37	57
Natural environments	9	80	29	60
Professional and ethical practice	23	97	66	91
Teaming process	14	89	40	77
Zero rejection	6	51	11	23

Table F16. *Instructional Strategies Used in Psychology Programs (n=74)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	24	85	46	61
Assistive technology	10	41	18	31
Child development	42	97	32	66
Child focused interventions	32	81	43	66
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	26	85	31	68
Due process	11	68	19	49
Family-centered practices	23	73	28	57
Family involvement	18	74	28	62
FAPE	8	57	15	45
IEP	10	69	26	51
IFSP	8	51	15	42
Instructional planning	15	55	23	45
Learning environments	19	66	23	53
Least Restrictive Environment	10	66	18	50
Multi-faceted assessment	22	62	32	50
Natural environments	15	55	15	43
Professional and ethical practice	19	82	34	65
Teaming process	11	54	32	57
Zero rejection	4	31	8	24

Table F17. *Instructional Strategies Used in Recreation Therapy Programs (n=14)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	29	100	71	86
Assistive technology	21	93	79	71
Child development	7	100	14	50
Child focused interventions	36	86	57	64
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	14	86	64	71
Due process	14	93	21	29
Family-centered practices	7	71	50	57
Family involvement	14	79	29	64
FAPE	21	71	29	29
IEP	21	79	50	43
IFSP	21	57	36	36
Instructional planning	29	79	64	57
Learning environments	43	79	50	57
Least Restrictive Environment	21	100	57	64
Multi-faceted assessment	21	93	50	64
Natural environments	14	86	43	64
Professional and ethical practice	14	93	71	71
Teaming process	14	79	64	86
Zero rejection	14	57	29	43

Table F18. *Instructional Strategies Used in Social Work Programs (n=41)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	22	76	44	78
Assistive technology	20	24	15	37
Child development	24	95	39	85
Child focused interventions	22	88	51	83
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	24	90	61	83
Due process	12	78	15	61
Family-centered practices	29	93	66	83
Family involvement	24	88	59	85
FAPE	12	39	7	44
IEP	12	44	5	49
IFSP	7	44	5	54
Instructional planning	5	17	7	32
Learning environments	10	37	17	44
Least Restrictive Environment	10	61	7	56
Multi-faceted assessment	17	68	42	63
Natural environments	17	61	32	63
Professional and ethical practice	22	90	71	85
Teaming process	17	66	54	71
Zero rejection	7	17	7	15

Table F19. *Instructional Strategies Used in Special Education Programs (n=61)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	38	93	72	75
Assistive technology	38	82	53	59
Child development	43	92	41	72
Child focused interventions	43	89	61	80
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	33	93	53	74
Due process	31	97	36	53
Family-centered practices	26	97	43	64
Family involvement	30	98	36	61
FAPE	25	98	38	56
IEP	34	97	82	82
IFSP	23	89	43	46
Instructional planning	43	98	82	87
Learning environments	41	97	72	90
Least Restrictive Environment	30	98	49	75
Multi-faceted assessment	38	95	74	71
Natural environments	26	93	39	75
Professional and ethical practice	33	98	54	79
Teaming process	31	97	79	79
Zero rejection	23	89	25	43

Table F20. *Instructional Strategies Used in Speech & Language Pathology Programs (n=40)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	35	100	63	100
Assistive technology	30	95	73	83
Child development	38	100	53	88
Child focused interventions	38	100	65	93
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	38	100	58	95
Due process	18	95	33	68
Family-centered practices	28	93	48	90
Family involvement	28	90	40	85
FAPE	20	93	28	68
IEP	23	98	50	83
IFSP	23	95	38	80
Instructional planning	23	88	48	83
Learning environments	23	93	40	73
Least Restrictive Environment	20	98	4	83
Multi-faceted assessment	25	95	50	80
Natural environments	25	83	33	73
Professional and ethical practice	28	100	55	73
Teaming process	25	90	45	85
Zero rejection	20	50	15	45

Table F21. *Instructional Strategies Used in Blended Programs (n=31)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	26	90	81	87
Assistive technology	13	84	77	65
Child development	52	94	55	84
Child focused interventions	29	90	81	87
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	36	87	61	84
Due process	7	87	39	26
Family-centered practices	26	87	81	77
Family involvement	32	90	74	84
FAPE	10	94	29	42
IEP	10	87	68	84
IFSP	7	90	61	74
Instructional planning	39	87	81	87
Learning environments	36	87	74	87
Least Restrictive Environment	13	90	48	68
Multi-faceted assessment	23	87	71	74
Natural environments	26	94	48	90
Professional and ethical practice	19	90	55	65
Teaming process	26	87	71	84
Zero rejection	7	74	13	36

Table F22. *Instructional Strategies Used in Other Programs (n=26)*

Practice	Independent Research	Lecture	Class Simulation	Field Experience
Assessment models	19	85	69	73
Assistive technology	15	62	42	58
Child development	23	89	35	69
Child focused interventions	27	77	54	85
Cultural & linguistic sensitivity	19	81	54	62
Due process	15	85	19	35
Family-centered practices	31	77	58	65
Family involvement	27	54	54	73
FAPE	15	77	19	31
IEP	19	92	58	73
IFSP	15	81	46	50
Instructional planning	27	85	69	65
Learning environments	31	85	58	69
Least Restrictive Environment	19	89	31	58
Multi-faceted assessment	19	69	50	54
Natural environments	23	81	39	62
Professional and ethical practice	23	85	54	69
Teaming process	15	69	62	77
Zero rejection	19	62	15	39

Table G1. *Areas Addressed by Program.*

	Assistive Technology	Families	Inclusion/ Natural Environments	Research and Evaluation	Team Process
Audiology (n=2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)	100 (2)
Counseling (n=34)	18 (6)	97 (33)	32 (11)	97 (33)	50 (17)
Early Childhood Education (n=89)	49 (44)	94 (84)	87 (77)	46 (41)	61 (54)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=36)	78 (28)	94 (34)	89 (32)	78 (28)	83 (30)
Early Intervention (n=9)	78 (7)	100 (9)	89 (8)	100 (9)	100 (9)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=7)	86 (6)	86 (6)	86 (6)	86 (6)	100 (7)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	86 (6)	71 (5)	57 (4)	86 (6)	86 (6)
Family Therapy (n=6)	17 (1)	100 (6)	17 (1)	100 (6)	17 (1)
Nursing (n=138)	24 (33)	98 (135)	20 (28)	47 (65)	54 (74)
Nutrition (n=11)	18 (2)	64 (7)	0 (0)	73 (8)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=45)	98 (44)	91 (41)	84 (38)	93 (42)	82 (37)
Physical Therapy (n=33)	82 (27)	88 (29)	70 (23)	91 (30)	91(30)
Psychology (n=68)	18 (12)	63 (43)	31 (21)	96 (65)	40 (27)
Recreation Therapy (n=15)	67 (10)	47 (7)	93 (14)	80 (12)	93 (14)
Social Work (n=40)	8 (3)	95 (38)	40 (16)	95 (38)	58 (23)
Special Education (n=57)	70 (40)	83 (47)	86 (49)	68 (39)	84 (48)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=43)	88 (38)	65 (28)	79 (34)	95 (41)	63 (27)
Blended Program (n=34)	77 (26)	94 (32)	88 (30)	85 (29)	88 (30)
Other Program (n=26)	42 (11)	81 (21)	81 (21)	69 (18)	69 (18)
Total (n=700)	**49 (346)***	**87 (607)***	**59 (415)***	**74 (518)***	**65 (454)***

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table G2. *Areas Addressed by Subgroup.*

Sub-Group	Assistive Technology	Families	Inclusion/Natural Environments	Research and Evaluation	Team Process
Degree Type					
Associates (n=103)	24 (25)	95 (98)	37 (38)	18 (19)	50 (51)
Undergraduate (n=242)	48 (117)	86 (207)	62 (150)	78 (188)	67 (161)
Masters (n=221)	61 (134)	87 (192)	66 (146)	91 (202)	72 (158)
Doctorate (n=34)	50 (17)	77 (26)	56 (19)	94 (32)	62 (21)
Multiple Degrees (n=67)	55 (37)	81 (54)	63 (42)	82 (55)	66 (44)
Other (n=26)	54 (14)	89 (23)	62 (16)	73 (19)	65 (17)
Total (n=693)	**50 (344)***	**87 (600)***	**59 (411)***	**74 (515)***	**65 (452)***
Carnegie Classification					
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=216)	57 (122)	85 (184)	60 (130)	88 (189)	70 (151)
Masters Colleges and Universities (n=268)	54 (144)	85 (228)	67 (179)	84 (224)	66 (178)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=82)	40 (33)	84 (69)	55 (45)	73 (60)	60 (49)
Associates Colleges (n=104)	26 (27)	95 (99)	39 (41)	20 (21)	48 (50)
Specialized Institutions (n=30)	67 (20)	90 (27)	67 (20)	80 (24)	87 (26)
Total (n=700)	**49 (346)***	**87 (607)**	**59 (415)***	**74 (518)***	**65 (454)***
Institutional Control					
Public, 4 year or above (n=387)	54 (208)	85 (328)	65 (250)	84 (326)	70 (271)
Private, 4 year or above (n=214)	52 (112)	86 (185)	60 (128)	82 (176)	64 (137)
Total (n=601)	**53 (320)**	**85 (513)**	**61 (378)**	**84 (502)**	**68 (408)**
Region					
Northeast (n=211)	55 (116)	83 (174)	65 (138)	77 (162)	65 (136)
Southeast (n=167)	52 (86)	88 (147)	57 (95)	77 (128)	67 (111)
Midwest (n=211)	46 (97)	86 (182)	56 (119)	71 (149)	61 (129)
West (n=111)	42 (47)	94 (104)	57 (63)	71 (79)	70 (78)
Total (n=700)	**49 (346)**	**87 (607)***	**59 (415)**	**74 (518)**	**65 (454)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table H1. *Opportunities to Work With or Learn About Children Birth to Five by Program.*

	Competency achievement	Non-credit course	Seminars, workshops	Service learning or other volunteer experience	Other
Audiology (n=2)	50 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	50 (1)	50 (1)
Counseling (n=20)	15 (3)	10 (2)	70 (14)	70 (14)	15 (3)
Early Childhood Education (n=76)	45 (34)	13 (10)	47 (36)	67 (51)	12 (9)
Early Childhood Special Education (n=19)	63 (12)	11 (2)	58 (11)	63 (12)	11 (2)
Early Intervention (n=9)	56 (5)	0 (0)	78(7)	78 (7)	11 (1)
Education of the Hearing Impaired (n=6)	17 (1)	17 (1)	67 (4)	83 (5)	33 (2)
Education of the Visually Impaired (n=7)	29 (2)	43 (3)	43 (3)	57 (4)	29 (2)
Family Therapy (n=4)	25 (1)	50 (2)	75 (3)	75 (3)	0 (0)
Nursing (n=135)	38 (51)	4 (5)	26 (35)	50 (67)	24 (32)
Nutrition (n=12)	17 (2)	0 (0)	33 (4)	83 (10)	0 (0)
Occupational Therapy (n=33)	39 (13)	9 (3)	61 (20)	97 (32)	18 (6)
Physical Therapy (n=30)	40 (12)	7 (2)	47 (14)	80 (24)	17 (5)
Psychology (n=51)	26 (13)	4 (2)	53 (27)	59 (30)	28 (14)
Recreation Therapy (n=14)	36 (5)	7 (1)	36 (5)	93 (13)	7 (1)
Social Work (n=36)	6 (2)	11 (4)	67 (24)	81 (29)	17 (6)
Special Education (n=39)	26 (10)	8 (3)	51 (20)	77 (30)	15 (6)
Speech & Language Pathology (n=28)	46 (13)	18 (5)	64 (18)	71 (20)	25 (7)
Blended Program (n=27)	37 (10)	7 (2)	52 (14)	70 (19)	19 (5)
Other Program (n=19)	26 (5)	0 (0)	42 (8)	53 (10)	58 (11)
Total (n=567)	34 (195)*	8 (47)*	47 (267)*	67 (381)*	20 (113)*

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05

Table H2. *Opportunities to Work With or Learn About Children Birth to Five by Subgroup.*

Sub-Group	Competency achievement	Non-credit course	Seminars, workshops	Service learning or other volunteer experience	Other
Degree Type					
Associates (n=99)	39 (39)	4 (4)	30 (30)	51 (50)	20 (20)
Undergraduate (n=197)	26 (51)	7 (13)	44 (86)	78 (153)	19 (38)
Masters (n=156)	40 (63)	14 (21)	63 (98)	66 (103)	21 (33)
Doctorate (n=29)	45 (13)	3 (1)	52 (15)	66 (19)	14 (4)
Multiple Degrees (n=58)	33 (19)	10 (6)	45 (26)	72 (42)	21 (12)
Other (n=21)	33 (7)	5 (1)	48 (10)	52 (11)	24 (5)
Total (n=560)	**34 (192)***	**8 (46)**	**47 (265)***	**68 (378)***	**20 (112)**
Carnegie Classification					
Doctoral/Research Universities (n=173)	38 (65)	12 (21)	54 (94)	65 (113)	24 (41)
Masters Colleges and Universities (n=196)	29 (56)	9 (17)	51 (99)	75 (147)	18 (36)
Baccalaureate Colleges (n=73)	33 (24)	4 (3)	36 (26)	77 (56)	14 (10)
Associates Colleges (n=95)	41 (39)	5 (5)	36 (34)	46 (44)	20 (19)
Specialized Institutions (n=30)	37 (11)	3 (1)	47 (14)	70 (21)	23 (7)
Total (n=567)	**34 (195)**	**8 (47)**	**47 (267)***	**67 (381)***	**20 (113)**
Institutional Control					
Public, 4 year or above (n=303)	33 (101)	10 (29)	53 (160)	69 (210)	21 (64)
Private, 4 year or above (n=172)	33 (57)	8 (13)	44 (76)	74 (128)	16 (28)
Total (n=475)	**33 (158)**	**9 (42)**	**50 (236)**	**71 (338)**	**19 (92)**
Region					
Northeast (n=165)	30 (49)	6 (10)	48 (79)	62 (103)	27 (44)
Southeast (n=137)	39 (54)	6 (8)	45 (62)	68 (93)	18 (25)
Midwest (n=183)	31 (57)	12 (21)	48 (87)	73 (134)	16 (29)
West (n=82)	43 (35)	10 (8)	48 (39)	62 (51)	18 (15)
Total (n=567)	**34 (195)**	**8 (47)**	**47 (267)**	**67 (381)**	**20 (113)**

* denotes a significant Chi-Square result ≤ .05