



National Landscape of Early Childhood Personnel Standards for Professionals Serving Infants and Young Children with Disabilities and Their Families under 619 and Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA)



Data Report 2



The contents of this report were developed under a grant from the US Department of Education, #H325B120004. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. Project Officer, Dawn Ellis, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE REPORT	1
METHODOLOGY	2
Sample	2
Data Collection: Telephone Interview	4
Protocol	4
Procedures	6
Data Analysis	7
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Components and Need Priorities	7
General comprehensive System of Personnel Development Needs	8
Additional Information	9
Reliability/Credibility	11
RESULTS	11
Summary of Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Components	11
Part C	13
Part B 619	13
The Highest Area of Need in Comprehensive System of Personnel Development	14
Part C	16
Part B 619	16
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Areas of Need	16
Part C	18
Part B 619	19
Additional Information Reported by State Coordinators	20
Part C	22
Part B 619	24
DISCUSSION	26

Limitations	27
CONCLUSION	27
REFERENCES	27

List of Tables

1. CSPD Components and the Definition of Each Component	5
2. Areas for Coding Statements regarding CSPD General Needs by Part C and Part B 619	9
3. Initial Areas for Coding Statements regarding Additional Information Provided by Part C and Part B 619	10
4. Number of Jurisdictions with CSPD Components in the Part B 619 (n =49) and Part C (n = 50) Systems across All States and the District of Columbia	12
5. The Highest Area of Need in CSPD under Part B 619 and Part C Systems across All States and the District of Columbia	15
6. The CSPD Needs Reported by the Part B 619 and Part C Coordinators across All States and the District of Columbia	17
7. Additional Information Reported by the Part B 619 and Part C Coordinators	21

List of Figures

1. Regional State Assignments for Data Collection	3
2. The Telephone Interview Procedures with State Part B 619 and Part C Coordinators	7
3. Statement Coding Process	8
4. Percent of CSPD Components in the Part B 619 and Part C Systems across All States and the District of Columbia	13
5. Percent of the Highest Area of Need in CSPD under Part B 619 and Part C Systems across All States and the District of Columbia	16

6. Percent of CSPD Needs in the Part B 619 and Part C Systems across All States and the District of Columbia	18
7. Additional Information Reported by Part B 619 and Part C Coordinators across All States and the District of Columbia	22



INTRODUCTION

The Early Childhood Personnel Center (referred to hereafter as the ECPC) is a national technical assistance center that was funded by the Office of Special Education Programs as a five-year project, starting in January 2013. The Center represents a collaborative effort of the University of Connecticut, Florida State University, the University of Kansas and the University of Oregon. The purpose of the ECPC is multi-fold:

- (1) to serve as a national resource on personnel standards, competencies, and recommended practices
- (2) to assist states in aligning personnel standards to national professional organization standards for personnel who serve children with disabilities and their families, integrating those standards with standards for early childhood personnel of all children, and linking those standards to state competencies and certification or licensure requirements
- (3) to assist state agencies and Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) in partnering to align pre-service and in-service training for personnel serving children with disabilities and their families
- (4) to assist States to integrate early childhood professional development systems to ensure that IDEA Part C and Part B 619 programs and personnel in each state are included in the state's professional development initiatives

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

One critical component of the ECPC activities is *Knowledge Generation*. This report focused on summarizing the data collected regarding the components of Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) in the state early intervention (EI) and early childhood special education (ECSE) systems via telephone interviews with Part B 619 and Part C coordinators. State coordinators were also asked to identify the CSPD components that are the most underdeveloped within their state. This information represents the current CSPD status and needs perceived by Part B 619 and Part C coordinators across all 50 states and in the District of Columbia, and will be used to guide the different levels of technical assistance that can be provided to states in developing and implementing an integrated CSPD so that:

- (1) Personnel can be empowered; and
- (2) Infants and young children with special needs and their families will receive effective interventions that lead to positive developmental and behavioral outcomes.


METHODOLOGY

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval

Before commencing the phone interviews, to safeguard the rights and welfare of the state coordinators involved in this study, approval for research was obtained from the IRBs of all four universities for the semi-structured interview protocol (see Appendix A).

Sample

Data pertaining to the status of specific CSPD components and need priority under Part B 619 and Part C of the IDEA were collected via telephone interviews with state coordinators across all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Seven territories including American Samoa, Guam, Marianna, Marshal Palou, Micronesia, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands were ultimately excluded from this data report because the coordinators were unavailable to participate in telephone interviews. State assignments across the four ECPC regional sites are displayed in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Regional state assignments for data collection

Even though numerous contact efforts were made, two Part B 619 coordinators and one Part C coordinator did not respond to the email and phone interview invitations. This data report summarizes the information collected from the interviews with 49 Part B 619 and 50 Part C coordinators.

Data Collection: Telephone Interview

Protocol. Appendix A includes a semi-structured protocol used to interview the state coordinators. The two overarching themes of the nine interview questions were: *Verification of state licensure/certification information* and *state CSPD components and needs*. Four questions asked the state coordinators to help review the information regarding state personnel standards of Part B 619 and Part C service providers collected via publicly available sources (see Data Report I for results); one question inquired about the national technical assistance center activities the state has participated in. This information will help the ECPC select states for receiving intensive and targeted technical assistance in the future. The other four questions focused on asking state coordinators whether a CSPD is in place, the level of implementation of the eight CSPD components, and what CSPD components would be the areas of need. Below are the eight different CSPD components that were used to direct the phone conversations:

- (1) Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities;
- (2) Appropriate licensing and certification;
- (3) Higher education programs to provide pre-service training;
- (4) Ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities;
- (5) Evaluation;
- (6) A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part B/C system;
- (7) Technical assistance availability; and
- (8) Dissemination.

Additional details and definitions of the eight components are provided in Table 1.


Table 1*CSPD Components and the Definition of Each Component*

CSPD components	Definition
Ongoing needs assessment	Data to document the needs of multiple audiences who comprise the early childhood workforce serving infants and young children with disabilities and their families.
Appropriate licensing and certification	State develops credentials that are specific EI and ECSE, and specifies the different requirements for those who provide services to infant and young children with disabilities and their families in personnel standards.
Higher education programs to provide pre-service training	Pre-service programs of study that result in a degree for those personnel who will provide services to infant and young children with disabilities and their families.
Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities	The state or regional CSPDs provide relevant training for personnel and parents that improve skills in serving infants and young children with disabilities. The opportunities are usually based upon data received from needs assessment and requirements of the state.
Evaluation	Formative and summative measures of CSPD component activities. The activities should be evaluated regarding their outcome and impact to programs for infant and young children with special needs to determine if these activities are making a real difference.
A data system for personnel employed in the Part B 619 and Part C systems	A state level data system that keeps track of the type of services, credentials, and professional development activities of the employees under the Part B 619 and Part C systems.
Technical assistance availability	The availability of the state CSPD in providing specific skill enhancement for an individual or group need.
Dissemination	CSPD involves the sharing of research validated educational and behavioral practices for service providers and parents of infants and young children with disabilities throughout the state.

Procedures. Regional interviewers conducted a 30-minute telephone interview with each Part B 619 and Part C coordinators of the states in their region. Contact information of the state coordinators was obtained from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center website or from the state government web pages, and was then organized into a contact list. An interview log was also used by each regional interviewer to record the frequency of contacts and track all procedures.

Prior to conducting the phone interviews, the project director trained and demonstrated the interview procedures to all regional interviewers. An interview protocol that details all the procedures was also provided to help guide the prompting words or questions, and improve the consistency in soliciting information (see Appendix B). Furthermore, the interviewers shared prompting techniques and reported progress during a biweekly data team conference call. Figure 2 is a flowchart depicting the phone interview procedures.

A verbal consent was obtained from the participant(s) at the beginning of the interview. To help improve the accuracy of note taking, the interviewer also asked for audio recording permission before proceeding with interview questions. All interview notes were sent to the state coordinators to confirm that all notes properly reflect the information shared during the interview. This member checking strategy helped ensure trustworthiness of the results.


Figure 2. The telephone interview procedures with state Part B 619 and Part C coordinators

Data Analysis

Comprehensive system of personnel development components and need priorities. The CSPD components and prioritized needs (see *Question #6 in Appendix A*) were first summarized by region in a CSPD summary form using the eight CSPD components listed in Tables 1, and then were compiled to create a national landscape. Frequency counts were computed by Part B 619 and Part C to identify the CSPD components in place and examine the needs and priority across all states and the District of Columbia.

General comprehensive system of personnel development needs. For the general CSPD needs (see *Question #7 in Appendix A*) shared by the state coordinators, pieces of statements were generated under Part C or Part B 619, respectively. These statements were categorized and coded through a three-step process that is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Statement coding process



For the general CSPD needs, state coordinators were also interviewed on their perceptions of the eight CSPD components in place in their states. Thus, these were used as the major areas for a reviewer to sort all statements and grouped the ones with similar content and meaning into themed areas (Patton, 1990). Additional areas (i.e., *everything; funding; practices; recruitment and retention; and don't know/unsure*) were developed for the needs that did not fit under the eight CSPD components. These initial areas are listed in Table 2. After having reliability check, no further area reductions were performed for statements regarding general CSPD needs. Frequency counts were then computed to identify the general CSPD needs of Part B 619 and Part C across all states and the District of Columbia.

Table 2*Areas for Coding Statements regarding CSPD General Needs by Part C and Part B 619*

	Part C	Part B 619
Area	1. Ongoing needs assessment	1. Ongoing needs assessment
	2. Appropriate licensure and certification	2. Appropriate licensure and certification
	3. Higher education programs to provide pre-service training	3. Higher education programs to provide pre-service training
	4. Ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities	4. Ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities
	5. Evaluation	5. Evaluation
	6. A data system for personnel	6. A data system for personnel
	7. Technical assistance availability	7. Technical assistance availability
	8. Dissemination	8. Dissemination
	9. Everything	9. Everything
	10. Practices	10. Practices
	11. Recruitment and retention	11. Recruitment and retention
	12. Unsure/don't know	12. Unsure/don't know
	13. Funding	

Additional information. Statements about additional information provided by the Part B 619 and Part C coordinators (see *Question #9 in Appendix A*) were sorted using the same the coding process shown in Figure 3. The reviewer compiled similar statements and developed initial coding areas by Part B 619 and Part C. The initial areas developed by the reviewer were listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Initial Areas for Coding Statements regarding Additional Information Provided by Part C and Part B 619

	Part C	Part B 619
Area	1. Administration	1. Administration
	2. Board Certified Behavior Analyst	2. Board Certified Behavior Analyst
	3. Coaching	3. Coaching
	4. Communication and collaboration	4. Communication and collaboration
	5. New license/certificate	5. New license/certificate
	6. Pre-service	6. Pre-service
	7. Professional development	7. Professional development
	8. Race to the Top	8. Race to the Top
	9. Recruitment and retention	9. Recruitment and retention
	9. Services	10. Services
	10. Service coordination	11. Service coordinator
	11. System	12. System
	12. Not applicable	13. Not applicable
	13. Current licensure/certification	14. Funding
	15. Everything	15. Standards
	16. Infant mental health	

After peer debriefing, the two reviewers discussed and further reduced the themed areas to five for both Part B 619 and Part C:

- Pre-service
- Professional development system (including professional development needs)
- Recruitment and retention
- Standards
- System (including Race to the Top)

Agreements and disagreements in interpretation of the responses were explored to help the two reviewers become aware of biases, perspectives, and assumptions (Merriam, 2009). Statements were then resorted based on the new areas. Frequency counts were then computed to quantify the additional needs Part B 619 and Part C have across all states and the District of Columbia.

Reliability/Credibility. Two reliability/credibility checks were conducted. First, inter-rater reliability that focused on the eight CSPD components listed in the telephone interview protocol (i.e., Question #6) was calculated. Two trained independent rater coded data for 22% of all phone calls conducted (22 of 99) by Region 1 (6 of 26; 23%), Region 2 (6 of 29; 21%), Region 3 (6 of 28; 21%), and Region 4 (4 of 16; 25%). Point-by-point agreement (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 2012) was used to calculate inter-rater reliability. At least 80% of agreement was achieved for each region, ranging from 88% - 92%. Second, to establish credibility, *all* sorted statements regarding the CSPD needs (i.e., Question #7) and additional information (i.e., Question #9) was independently reviewed by a second reviewer to determine whether the classification was pertinent. The two reviewers reached 100% agreement for the area that each statement was placed under in both Part C and Part B Part B 619 for Question #7, and in Part B Part B 619 for Question #9. Nonetheless, the two reviewers agreed on 90% of all statements in Part C of Question #9. After discussions, consensus was reached for the categorization of 100% of the statements.

RESULTS

In the following sections, the national landscape of CSPD components and needs under Part B 619 and part C of IDEA are presented. Information regarding the variables is categorized into the following four topics: (1) Summary of CSPD components; (2) the highest areas of need in CSPD; (3) general CSPD needs; and (4) additional information. One critical note is that three state coordinators (two in Part B 619 and one in Part C) did not participate in the study despite all contacting efforts by the interviewers. Thus, this section summarizes the findings from interviews with the 50 Part C coordinators and the 49 Part B 619 coordinators.

Summary of Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Components

Information regarding the CSPD components reported by the 50 Part C coordinators and the 49 Part B 619 coordinators is summarized in Table 4 and Figure 4. Findings of Part C and Part B 619 are separately presented.


Table 4

Number of Jurisdictions with CSPD Components in the Part B 619 (n =49) and Part C (n = 50) Systems across All States and the District of Columbia

CSPD Components	Part C	Part B 619
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Technical assistance availability	37	32
Appropriate licensure and certification	37	36
Dissemination	36	29
Higher education programs to provide pre-service training	31	33
Ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities	29	29
Ongoing needs assessment	27	15
A data system for personnel	26	25
Evaluation	18	17

Note: CSPD = Comprehensive system of personnel development.

Figure 4. Percent of CSPD components in the Part B 619 and Part C systems across all states and the District of Columbia



Part C. Fifty Part C coordinators were surveyed and were asked to describe how the CSPD components look like in their states. Of all the participating Part C coordinators, 74% ($n = 37$) of them indicated that their states have *appropriate licensure/certification* for the Part C personnel, and that the *technical assistance availability* of their states is adequate. In terms of the CSPD components that the least states have, *evaluation* was the component identified by the interview participants. Similar to the Part B 619 coordinators, the Part C coordinator also reported that the evaluation questions generally focus on content and quality of the training, but have not further examined the impact made by training and technical assistance.

Part B 619. Forty-nine Part B 619 coordinators participated in the telephone interview and provided information regarding the CSPD components in place for the Part B 619 system. According to the responses from these coordinators, the CSPD component that is in place for the highest percent of states is *appropriate licensure and certification* ($n = 36$; 73%). Anecdotally the Part B 619 coordinators also indicated that there is appropriate licensure/certification for Part B service providers. *Ongoing needs assessment* and *evaluation* are the two CSPD components that the least states have in their Part B 619 system. Several Part

B 619 coordinators mentioned that their states have informal needs assessment (e.g., via conversations, phone calls) to help identify training topics and technical assistance needs that should be provided to the service providers, but these are not ongoing or systematic. Likewise, the coordinators reported that their states primarily ask training attendants to complete a few post-training rating questions regarding content and quality, but have not started to examine the impact of CSPD on teacher and child behaviors.

The Highest Areas of Need in Comprehensive System of Personnel Development


Table 5 and Figure 5 presented state-level information regarding the highest areas of need in CSPD indicated by the 49 Part B 619 coordinators and the 50 Part C coordinators. A state coordinator may report *more than one* CSPD area as their need priority. In total, four Part C coordinators prioritized more than one CSPD need areas ($n = 54$), and three Part B 619 coordinators identified more than one CSPD need priorities ($n = 52$). Findings of Part B 619 and Part C were described respectively.

Table 5

The Highest Area of Need in CSPD under Part B 619 and Part C Systems across All States and the District of Columbia

Top CSPD Components of Needs	Part C	Part B 619
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Evaluation	19	10
Ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities	8	9
Ongoing needs assessment	7	5
Higher education programs to provide pre-service training	6	3
A data system for personnel	5	3
Appropriate licensure and certification	3	5
Dissemination	3	3
Other (i.e., recruitment and retention, collaboration, knowledge about the systems in other states)	3	5
Technical assistance availability	0	1
No needs or not specified	2	8

Figure 5. Percent of the highest area of need in CSPD under Part B 619 and Part C systems across all states and the District of Columbia



Part C. A similar result was reported with Part C coordinators. Of all 50 Part C coordinators interviewed, one-third (35%; $n = 19$) identified *evaluation* as the top need priority in CSPD components. Other areas of need named by approximately one-eighth of the state coordinators were *ongoing, systematic, and effectiveness professional development in-service opportunities* ($n = 8$; 15%) and *ongoing needs assessment* ($n = 7$; 13%).

Part B 619. During the phone interviews, forty-nine Part B 619 coordinators were asked to identify the highest areas of needs in CSPD. 19% ($n = 10$) indicated *evaluation*, and 17% ($n = 9$) mentioned *ongoing, systematic, and effectiveness professional development in-service opportunities*. 15% ($n = 8$) chose not to or did not specify any areas of need.

Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Areas of Need


State coordinators were also surveyed on additional state-level CSPD needs. A total 103 statements regarding state-level CSPD needs were reported by Part C interviewees and 94 were mentioned by Part B 619 interviewees. Table 6 and Figure 6 provide a summary of the results.

Table 6

The CSPD Needs Reported by the Part B 619 and Part C Coordinators across All States and the District of Columbia

Areas of Need	Part C	Part B 619
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
CSPD Components		
Evaluation	21	16
Ongoing needs assessment	12	16
Ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities	16	23
A data system for personnel	11	5
Higher education programs to provide pre-service training	10	8
Appropriate licensure and certification	6	3
Technical assistance availability	4	5
Dissemination	3	9
Additional Areas		
Practices	7	3
Recruitment and retention	6	1
Everything	4	5
What other states are doing	2	-
Funding	1	-

Figure 6. Percent of CSPD needs in the Part B 619 and Part C systems across all States and the District of Columbia



Part C. One-fifth of the state coordinators pinpointed *evaluation* ($n = 21$; 20%) as a CSPD area of need. Likewise, 16% of coordinators ($n = 16$) identified *ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities* as a state-level need. *Dissemination* had the least amount of coordinators reported as a need area – only 3% ($n = 3$). In addition to the eight CSPD areas, state coordinators specified five additional need areas: *everything*, *funding*, *practices*, *recruitment and retention*, and *what other states are doing*. *Practices* ($n = 7$; 7%) and *recruitment and retention* ($n = 6$; 6%) were the need areas for the most state coordinators. Same definitions were applied to the areas shared by Part B 619 and Part C. A few instances of the *everything* area were:

- A comprehensive professional development system that leads to implementation fidelity that leads to a system change as the outcome.
- Everything

Some examples of the *practices* category included:

- More information and research on the evidence base around service coordinators (e.g., job description, criteria regarding how service coordinators should function, effective and validated practices).
- If a new best practice comes up, we might need some assistance around that.

Examples of statements under the *recruitment and retention* category were:

- Pre-service availability and recruitment in early childhood special education are a need for personnel who have a solid background in early childhood special ed.
- Recruitment and retention.

Any statement in regards to funding would be placed under the *funding* area. An example was:

- Would like to have more funding.

In some statements, the state coordinators indicated an interest in learning about the system in states of comparable sizes. These are grouped as the area – *what other states are doing*. An example would be:

- Interested in the other things other states of a comparable size are doing.

For all statements listed by areas, please see Appendix C.

Part B 619. When asked to identify additional state-level CSPD need areas, among the eight CSPD components, one-fourth of the state coordinators indicated that an *ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities* is a need ($n = 23$; 24%). Approximately 17% ($n = 16$) of state coordinators considered *ongoing needs assessment and evaluation* as additional CSPD areas of need, whereas 3% of coordinator ($n = 3$) reported *appropriate licensure/certification* as a need area. Interviewees also specified other need areas in regards to professional development, including *everything* ($n = 5$; 5%), *practices* ($n = 3$; 3%), and *recruitment and retention* ($n = 1$; 1%). The *everything* area consisted of statements that mentioned a need that was broad and general, and involved all aspects of the state-level system. Some examples of the *everything* area included:

- We have no control over the family care providers. It will be helpful to have some kind of guidance/guidelines for community colleges and for private preschools (public schools for sure are inclusive, but want to know how the private preschools are doing).

- The cost-benefit challenge: Make it possible financially and staffing-wise for people to engage in the professional development they need, but not increase their burden.

In terms of *practices*, any statement that indicated the needs of being updated with new practices or working on certain practices would be in this area. Some instances of the *practices* area were:

- Next priority is preschool least restricted environment at supporting co-teaching and appropriate assessments, and IEP development for children in age 3-5.
- Stay updated with new practices.

Statements categorized under the *recruitment and retention* area were about shortages of qualified personnel, or the state-level needs to retain adequate staff to serve children with special needs. An example of the *recruitment and retention* area included:

- Highest area of need is a better way of assuring there are enough practitioners for districts. Seems to be a disconnect between linking graduates of higher education programs with district programs that need licensed practitioners.

For all statements listed by areas, please see Appendix C.

Additional Information Reported by State Coordinators

At the end of the interview, state coordinators were asked to share additional information on aspects of CSPD. Eighty-one statements regarding additional Part C information and 58 statements about additional Part B 619 information were categorized into five areas, respectively. The categories and their descriptions are as following:

- *Pre-service*: Statements regarding higher education programs, personnel preparation, or offering courses or credits to meet personnel standards.
- *Professional development system (including professional development needs)*: Statements about training needs and formats, coaching, or anything related to professional development system.
- *Recruitment and retention*: Statements regarding the state-level needs or efforts to induct or retain adequate staff to serve children with special needs.
- *Standards*: Statements about licensure/certification requirements, new license/certificate, or information about a specific license/certificate.

- *System (including Race to the Top)*: Statements about Race to the Top, or general issues in the state-level system.


Results are presented in Table 7 and Figure 7.

Table 7

Additional Information Reported by the Part B 619 and Part C Coordinators

Top CSPD Components of Needs	Part C	Part B 619
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
System (including Race to the Top)	32	19
Professional development system (including professional development needs)	18	15
Standards	16	9
Recruitment and retention	9	9
Pre-service	6	6

Figure 7. Additional information reported by Part B 619 and Part C coordinators across all States and the District of Columbia



Part C. About 40% ($n = 32$) of Part C coordinators further provided information on their needs in *system* issues. Some examples were:

- It would be great if your center can establish a community of practice for people to share what they are doing in their states and share resources.
- How can we connect Part C & B?
- How can we incorporate what each agency is providing? How can we work collaboratively with them? Some agencies are more forthcoming with providers that are struggling. It is kind of hit or miss about how much information we get. Coordinators know there is support from the state for them.
- Can't get the lead agency to back us. If we had more power to do what needs to be done, our quality would improve greatly. "Providers sign voucher agreements saying that they will comply in these areas – sign and date them. And when they break those agreements he won't allow us to enforce any consequences on those programs. So everyone knows we have no teeth to enforce the policies that we already have."

- If we get Race to the Top, we are looking at full implementation and working with the existing early intervention in three years.

22% ($n = 18$) of state coordinators mentioned additional issues in *professional development system*. A few instances would be:

- TA that would support coaching and mentoring of Therapists is high priority
- Pulling PD committee back on track – need to go beyond being reactionary
- Difficult to provide a systematic approach to professional development training since there is no single approach to early intervention adopted across the state; approaches are more eclectic and multifaceted.

For *standards*, 20% ($n = 16$) of the coordinators indicated additional needs or issues in this area. Examples of statements under this area were:

- Infant Mental Health – myth that we don't serve kids with SE delay – high need
- Chart crosswalks or links between EI service, provider discipline, and qualifications
- Early intervention personnel have higher standards (serving infants/toddlers and provide home-based and community-based services) than early childhood special education personnel.
- Thinking about the differences in practices between infants-toddlers and preschool. May promote an infant toddler certificate.

Recruitment and retention and *pre-service* had 11% ($n = 9$) and 7% ($n = 6$) of interviewees further reflected on state-level challenges or current situations, respectively. A few instances of *recruitment and retention* would be:

- Provider shortages
- Recruitment and retention is an area of need. Recently administered a retention survey of staff to gain information about who they are, why they came to work in early intervention, and how long they are going to stay. The next step is to analyze the data to determine how to improve recruitment and retention.
- Recruitment and retention is a big need for us. We can't pay Part C providers enough! They can make much more money going to work for school-age. We are really struggling with getting related services.

Some statements categorized under the *pre-service* area were:

- Higher ed faculty does not know Part C services as well as needed to support the transition to coaching.... Insufficient information is offered on the Part C specific approaches to either educators or therapists
- For those who come from the clinical arena, the IHE needs to better prepare them in working with infants and young children with special needs.
- Hope to get Race to the Top so we can have seed money to potentially offer 4 to 6 college level courses that EI folks can take to fulfill the requirements.

For all statements by area, see Appendix D.

Part B 619. 33% ($n = 19$) of the additional information shared by the Part B 619 coordinators was about issues or current status of the state-level system. Some examples of *system* (including *Race to the Top*) would be:

- With our 619 folks, one of the topics we are trying to focus in on now are the eligibility piece (e.g., the type of tools that are being used for eligibility, how is eligibility being determined) and the whole IEP process (e.g., the present level of development, IEP process and the development of good and measureable goals).
- We have an EC Group that involves SPED, Missouri Preschool Project, and Title 1. Trying to develop some guidance for districts for how they can blend and braid funds to expand their capacity to provide EC services for more kids.
- RTT – focus is on Kindergarten entry assessment development and Early Learning Development Standards

26% ($n = 15$) of the statements were about *professional development system*. A few instances of the statements were:

- More programs using our ECO / outcome data- to drive their instruction. Some programs are doing well and others are struggling. Many teachers have AA degrees - so they have not had IHE coursework - so we train them through Results Matter to look at data to drive instruction.
- Face-to-face trainings have been beneficial in the past, may be difficult to switch to completely web-based.
- What are some good models - training for our therapist in that coaching model.

In terms of *recruitment and retention* or *standards*, each had approximately 16% ($n = 9$) of all categorized statements. Some statements that were placed in the *recruitment and retention* area were:

- Shortage of PT and SLPs -- Tele-help opportunities (rural state - spend a lot of money on travel)
- Dire situation with recruiting & retaining SPED teachers -- conflict between high standards / highly qualified (i.e. state wants them to have a dual certificate) yet we have a significant shortage
- Recruitment & retention (lost a lot of personnel after Katrina especially in rural areas; also challenging to recruit personnel (especially related disciplines) to work with b-5 rather than with other populations. Doing a good job broadly with special education, but struggle with recruiting personnel for preschool special education.

Examples of statements under the *standards* area would be:

- BCBA: No state-level certificate. We do not endorse the certificate and do not provide recommendations. If a school district needs the personnel, they can hire the personnel and set the requirements at the local level. We provide guidelines and give guidance if the school district decides to hire the personnel.
- Coaching Certificate – Are other states doing it?
- Independent licensure board – not connected to them. “I don’t even know who to call”

Comparing to other areas, the least amount of coordinators had provided additional information regarding *pre-service* ($n = 6$; 10%). A few examples would be:

- No undergrad ECSE programs in the state
- “Boot Camp” – Alt licensure program to quickly get SPED teachers into the classroom.
- SPED minor is all that is required for our preschool (619); not very detailed

For all statements by area, see Appendix D.

DISCUSSION

Originally, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) of 1975, and the later IDEA mandated the establishment of a CSPD to address personnel shortages (Bruder, 2010). Today, Part B programs are no longer required to have a CSPD under IDEA, but Part C still requires a CSPD. Thus, the results indicated that Part C systems had more CSPD components in place than Part B 619 systems.

Nevertheless, when further examined each CSPD component and the percent of states across Part B 619 and Part C, the components that had the overall highest percent (i.e., *appropriate licensure and certification* and *technical assistance availability*) were only at 74%. Even though IDEA mandated the establishment of a CSPD in Part C, one-fourth or more of the states do not have all the components in place. Of all state coordinators in either Part B 619 and Part C roles, about 15% of the coordinators in Part B 619 and 4% coordinators in Part C did not specify a need or reported no needs in CSPD. For these states, the coordinators were generally satisfied with the professional development in place, or requested time to gain a comprehensive understanding of what the ECPC can offer in assisting states to build an infrastructure in CSPD.

State coordinators (in either Part B 619 or Part C roles) had identified *evaluation, ongoing, systematic, and effective professional development in-service opportunities, and ongoing needs assessment* as the top areas of need. Even when being surveyed for general CSPD needs, these three areas continued to be the areas of concern. Other than the eight components listed in the interview protocol, state coordinators also identified other needs in the professional development system of their states. The two recurring themes are *recruitment and retention*, and *systemic concerns*. Several state coordinators mentioned the challenges of retaining qualified personnel to serve young children with special needs and their families, as well as the need of inducting individuals who are interested in working with this population. Another group of state coordinators elaborated on the current status and challenges encountered in the EI or ECSE system in their states. The state coordinators also stressed the importance of learning about how other states of a comparable size and with similar amount of resources maintain an ongoing and sustainable CSPD (or professional development for some Part B 619 states) system.

Limitation

A limitation should be noted for this study – the findings were primarily from the self reports of state coordinators. Even though a table with definitions of CSPD components was provided with the interview protocol (see Appendix A) prior to the interview call, conclusions regarding the CSPD components in place for states should still be cautiously drawn.

CONCLUSION

As mentioned earlier, a well-established and integrated CSPD is one critical piece in preparing and empowering a high-quality workforce. The knowledge generated from this study will contribute to the understanding of the current CSPD status and needs under Part B 619 and Part C systems across states and the District of Columbia. The information further supports the importance of ECPC providing different levels of technical assistance to states to help with the establishment of a sustainable and effective CSPD. This integrated CSPD model may truly benefit the early childhood workforce, infants and young children with disabilities, and their families. Most importantly, the results urge the necessity of promoting communication and collaborations between state personnel in the Part B 619 and Part C systems, and such opportunities should be provided constantly and consistently as a community of practice so that state coordinators can learn from other states and will feel being well supported while working on improving the CSPD in their states.

REFERENCES

- Bruder, M.B. (2010). Early childhood intervention: A promise to children and families. *Exceptional Children*, 76, 339-355.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Salvia, J., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Bolt, S. (2012). *Assessment: In special and inclusive education*. Independence, KY: Cengage Learning.

APPENDIX A

Verification Interview Protocol
National Licensure, Certification and Endorsement Criteria Study
Analysis of State Licensure/Certification Requirements
For Early Childhood Special Educators and Related Disciplines
Telephone Verification

Circle one: **Part C** **Part B 619**

ID: _____

Date Web search completed: _____

Date of phone verification: _____ State/Territory: _____

Interviewer: _____

Participant: _____ Title: _____

Hello, this is _____ from the Early Childhood Personnel Center. As part of the Center, we are calling to ask you a few questions to confirm some information we have on licensing/certification, higher education programs and professional development programs for personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers under Parts C and B of IDEA.

We would like to spend about 30 minutes with you while we ask you some questions to verify this information. Is this a good time for you?

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

Before we begin I would like to inform you that your participation is voluntary and if you wish not to answer any of the questions, I will respect your decision. You may withdraw or stop participating in this survey at any time. You will not be paid for completing this survey. The information we are asking you to verify has been collected through publicly available sources. Your name will not be used in the reporting of the data, information will be reported by state. Anything that you report as your own opinion will not be identified by name or by state and this data will be coded using a two digit code.

Questions about this study may be directed to the Principal Investigator, Dr. Mary Beth Bruder at 860-679-1500, or IRB Representative at 860-679-8729 or 860-679-3054.

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Name: _____

Phone number: _____

Fax: _____

Email: _____

Date or day of week: _____

Time: _____

Web Search Table-

The websites and documents listed in the excel spreadsheet were reviewed to identify specific certification/ licensure requirements in your state for individuals who work with children birth to five years with developmental delays or disabilities. Your assistance in reviewing the table for completeness and accuracy is requested. Please provide any missing information and correct any inaccurate information. If comments would help us understand any specific requirements, please provide them.

(If necessary ask for information that could not be found during the web review.)

____ Table was reviewed with Coordinator **during** phone verification call

____ Table was reviewed by Coordinator **before** phone verification call

Interview Protocol-

1. Are the licensing/certification requirements accurate as you know it? Why or why not?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Are there any changes anticipated in the licensing/certification for any discipline? If yes please describe.

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. We have developed a list of universities and colleges in your state that offer approved programs for these licensure/certifications for these disciplines (please see spreadsheet). Are there additional universities or colleges that you are aware of that should be listed? If you are not the person who has that information could you provide the contact person and his/her contact information, or is there a website where we could obtain that information?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Website URL: _____

Name of contact person for university list: _____

Phone number: _____

Email: _____

4. Does your state have a “system” for providing on-going training and technical assistance (T/TA) to those serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities? By “system” we refer to an infrastructure that is funded, provides for individualized and on-going professional development (vs. periodic workshops), and is sustainable and accountable.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please explain your answer.

5. Does your state have a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) for Part C/B?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. If your state **has** a CSPD, which of the following components do you feel you have addressed adequately to meet the needs of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities? Please explain your answers.

If your state **does not** have a CSPD, which of the following components do you feel would be the highest areas of need for your state to implement? Please describe and explain your answers.

- ☐ Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities
- ☐ Appropriate licensing and certification
- ☐ Higher education programs to provide preservice training
- ☐ Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development inservice opportunities
- ☐ Evaluation
- ☐ A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part C/B system that includes the above
- ☐ Technical assistance availability
- ☐ Dissemination

7. In which of the above areas of a CSPD do you feel your state has a need for technical assistance? Please describe.
8. Has your state previously or is your state currently participating in any National TA Center activities? If yes, what TA Center and what is the focus or expected outcome?
9. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding the licensure/certification requirements for EI or ECSE personnel in your state? Is there anyone else you feel we should speak with to help complete this analysis?

Thank you for your time in completing this interview. The information you have shared will provide us with a greater understanding of ECSE licensure/certification requirements. We sincerely appreciate your thoughtful responses and your contribution to our research efforts. Your responses will be transcribed and e-mailed to you so that you can review them for accuracy.

If you have any questions/concerns please free to contact:
Dr. Mary Beth Bruder at 860 679-1500.

Table 1: Critical Components of a CSPD

Needs Assessment: The state conducts an annual in service needs assessment using a representative sample of certified staff, non-certified staff, and parents. The goal is to identify training needs, develop a system to evaluate CSPD components, activities, and projects, and ensure that each CSPD component includes collaboration. The results of the needs assessment is the catalyst for determining in service training and technical assistance.

Preservice: Pre service is the preparation of certified and non-certified staff for employment as administrators and service providers for students with disabilities. Institutions of higher education are given the responsibility to prepare individuals with adequate skills that lead to quality services. CSPD will collaborate with higher education in strengthening educational training programs to help ensure quality staff. CSPD should be involved with certification issues and assuring collaboration between the various institutions of higher learning.

Inservice: The state and regional CSPD Councils and school districts provide relevant training for staff and parents that improves skills in serving students with disabilities. In service is usually based upon data received from needs assessment and requirements of the state.

Technical Assistance: The state CSPD provides trainers and technical assistance providers for a wide variety of critical issues. The end result will be quality education and services for students with disabilities.

Collaboration: Collaboration involves sharing resources and information, setting common goals, and working together. Collaboration is the glue that holds the other CSPD Components together. A main objective of CSPD is to offer opportunities for members of the educational community and parents to work together for a common cause, namely improving services to students with disabilities. The CSPD Council is made up of a broad representative of stakeholders, including parents. Council meetings and activities offer the opportunity for CSPD stakeholders to communicate and collaborate with each other.

Dissemination: CSPD involves the dissemination of research validated educational and behavioral practices for service providers of students with disabilities. Promising practices are shared with educators and parents throughout the state.

Evaluation: All CSPD activities should be evaluated regarding their outcome and impact to programs for students with disabilities. Evaluation helps determine if CSPD activities are making a real difference. Each section of the CSPD strategic plan should have an evaluation component. Evaluation results should be used as part of the decision making process.

Recruitment/Retention: There are frequent shortages of qualified special education personnel, especially in rural areas. Planning and collaboration should occur at the state, regional and school district level to ensure adequate staff to serve the needs of students with disabilities. Strategies need to be implemented that promote retaining qualified staff members.

APPENDIX B

Interviewer Protocol



Analysis of State Licensure/Certification Requirements for Parts B and C Services Related Disciplines: Telephone Verification

Interviewer Protocol

Pre-Conditions

- ☐ Compile a region specific contact log that has the contact information of the Part C and 619 Coordinators. Use this form to track every attempt you make to reach each individual, outcomes of each attempt and document dates interviews are scheduled and occur. *(A contact log sample can be found in SS ECPC sheet – currently row #50 Conduct interviews in each state).*
- ☐ Share your contact log with Ann and the regional directors on a weekly basis.

Call/Email to Establish Interview

- ☐ Compile the data you collected for the state. Use the “*filter*” function in SS to help export only the state data you need into excel. Within an excel file, create a spreadsheet for each discipline and convert the whole excel file into one PDF. *(A data table sample can be found in SS ECPC sheet – Row #51 Compile data...; to convert the whole excel file into one PDF, you can set the print setting as “Print the entire workbook” and print in PDF).*
 - **Important:** Save your data tables to SS ECPC Interview Calendar with the interview appointment row. Use common file name format “**STATE_ data tables_DATE**” (e.g., **RI_data tables_081613**).
- ☐ First contact can be by e-mail or phone *(please refer to Emily’s email for a sample email to the coordinators)*, if:
 - **Able to make contact:** Schedule the interview and share your contact information with the coordinators. Tell interviewee you will follow up with an email that will contain the state level data and the interview protocol *(The interview protocol can be found in SS ECPC sheet – Row #24 Complete IRB Approval).*
 - **Unable to make contact:** If you are not able to reach the individual via email, call after 2-3 days if you have not heard back. If you are not able to reach the individual, leave a detailed message including your name, phone number, and reason for the call. If the person does not call you back within one day, call again.

If you reach their voicemail again, leave a message with the same information, adding that you know that their schedule is very busy but could they please call as soon as is convenient. Same procedures apply for contacting via phone calls.

- ☐ Use Calendar in SS to document and track scheduled interviews. (*Use the ECPC Interview Calendar sheet*).
 - **Invite your regional directors to listen in the first few calls. Ann will join some of the calls from each region.**
- ☐ Send email with state level data and the interview protocol Allow 3-4 days to up to a week for review. In the email, also confirm the appointment date, time and phone number to call with the interviewee.
- ☐ Send a friendly reminder to the coordinator a day or two before the scheduled interview.

The Interview

Prior to Scheduled Interview:

- ☐ A copy of the telephone interview protocols with prompts. (*The interview protocol can be found in SS ECPC sheet – Row #24 Complete IRB Approval*).
- ☐ Recording equipment and materials.
 - Please make sure your volume is turned all the way up during the phone interview so that the people getting interviewed are clearly recorded.
- ☐ Clock to note the start and end times for interview.

Conducting the Telephone Interview:

- ☐ Please note start and completion times of each interview. (*Can record this in your contact log or in SS ECPC Interview Calendar sheet, “Comments” section*)
- ☐ Interviewers should follow the interviewing protocol, but you may skip sections if the person says they don’t have any information on that section.
 - **Important:** Read the entire introduction to the study on the first page of the survey and the agreements on the second page to secure permission to record. If the person agrees to have the interview recorded, continue. If the person declines, do not record the interview.
- ☐ State the title of the interviewee and state name at the start of recording.

- During the interview, orient the interviewee to the structure of the interview. Ask overall general questions noted on survey with prompts as needed. Interviewers should focus on probing for more in-depth information, unless the interviewee declines to be recorded then take as many notes as you can.
 - **Some examples of good probes:**
 - How do you do that.....?
 - Can you tell me more about that...?
 - Do you have examples of this?
 - Can you give me a more detailed description of what happens?
 - I think I understand what you mean; can you talk more about that?
 - I'm not sure I understand what you mean, can you help me...
 - I'm having trouble understanding the problem you have described; can you talk a little more about that?
 - **Other approaches for soliciting more information:**
 - Processing what the person said and giving feedback is helpful
 - You have already answered.....but is there anything else you want to add?
 - I heard you say.....is that correct?
 - Asking if there is anyone else that are key players that you could interview. Prompt the interviewee to give you the names, titles, and contact information.
- If time get short, ask about the possibility of scheduling a second/follow up call.

Following Completion of Interview:

- If you record the interview, make sure the sound file is saved to your computer. Please save file as a .wav file or as a .mp3 file. Label the sound file with **the state name and the title of the person you interviewed (e.g., RI Part B Coordinator)**. Note in the *Contact Log* whether or not the interview was recorded.
 - **Important:** Keep recordings and notes secure per IRB guidelines. (Code your participants accordingly as well)
 - IMMEDIATELY or as soon as possible after the call, expand your interview notes. If you have any additional interpretations, comments etc from the interview please upload those to the interview calendar as a separate file. Use common file name format “**STATE_Part C (or B)_ Interpretations_Date**” (e.g., **RI_Part B_ Interpretations_081613**).
- Upload your initial notes to the ECPS interview calendar in the row that pertains to the interview. Use the common file name format, “**STATE_ PartC (orB)_ initial interview notes_DATE**”
- Upload your audio recording of the interview to the same location. Use the file name format, “**STATE_ PartC (orB)_ Interview Audio_DATE**”

- Email the interview notes to the interviewee asking them to review and offer them the opportunity to expand, clarify, correct.
 - **Email Survey for approval to Interviewee:** Once you have embedded the expanded notes into the survey, email the survey to the interviewee.
 - **Remind interviewee to approve survey:** Remind the interviewee via email to approve/modify the notes if you have not heard from them for about a week. If the interviewee does not respond within 2 weeks, the notes will be considered approved.
 - **Interviewee responds with changes:** Any feedback, changes made by the interviewee should be identified in a different color or a different font.
- After you receive feedback or approval from the interviewee, incorporate the feedback into a final version of the notes, and then submit to SS in the interview calendar row that corresponds to the interview. Use common file name format “STATE_Part C (or B)_ Interview notes_Date” (e.g., RI_Part B_ Interview notes_081613)

Final process:

- After the interview has been completed and you have received feedback, make any revisions to the state data tables and upload to the Interview Calendar using the common file name, “STATE_ FINAL data tables_DATE” (e.g., RI_data tables_081613).
 - **Please do this even if you make no changes. *There is no need to make revisions in the second ECPC SS data base sheet. Only need to make changes to the data tables.***

APPENDIX C

All Statements regarding CSPD Needs by Area

Part B – Ongoing Need Assessment

Ongoing needs assessment

Then needs assessment

Needs Assessment

TA in the following areas would be beneficial: Needs assessment

Needs assessment

Needs assessment – to look at the current reality; What are your outcomes? Are you doing it effectively and efficiently?

Needs Assessment would be the priority

Ongoing needs assessment-- assess how to best utilize limited resources by focusing the trainings and TA on the identified needs of programs.

Ongoing needs assessment. The more both of these can be formalized in state policy the more sustainable they will be when people leave the position and a new person takes over.

Ongoing Needs Assessment

Ongoing Needs Assessment – answers from last needs assessment are not consistent across different locations. Want more information on why the answers differ.

Ongoing needs assessment:

Will be good to know (do not do annual needs assessment).

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

Don't have this and can use some support in this area.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

Might be a good thing to know about the guidance other states are giving for needs assessment.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

- Still need to work on ensuring that the institute has addressed all the professional development needs of all the programs.
- It is a need for 619.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

Will be a needed area in the future. There are some reasons now that I will not put it on the top list of my needs.

Part B – Appropriate Licensing and Certification

Licensing & Certification - 619 ECSE endorsement - shortage of teachers (serve both in school district classrooms and in the community)

Licensing (dual licensure)

Appropriate licensing and certification:

We will need to look at the licensing and certification for the B-3 field and figure out what the core competencies are for working with young children.

Part B – Everything

Challenges in early childhood – most providers are private providers and NY is a big state with many of them.

Other needs?

We have no control over the family care providers. It will be helpful to have some kind of guidance/guidelines for community colleges and for private preschools (public schools for sure are inclusive, but want to know how the private preschools are doing)

Other needs?

The cost-benefit challenge: Make it possible financially and staffing-wise for people to engage in the professional development they need, but not increase their burden.

Additional Needs Identified:

- Overall need for figuring out how EI/ECSE fits into the larger system of early childhood professional development in the state (e.g., accessing scholarship money, stipends, incentives).
- Identifying and problem-solving around roadblocks so that EI/ECSE and ECE professional development can be integrated rather than parallel systems.

Because the preschool stuff cuts across Part B 619, Part C, Child Development Block Grant folks and Head Start, it will be important to make sure what Part B 619 creates is inclusive

Part B – Higher Education Programs to Provide Pre-Service Training

Biggest area of need is the connection between the Office of Early Learning and School Readiness – looking at preschool and having connections to higher ed

Preservice and connections to IHE

First priority area is Higher Ed

Preservice and connections to IHE

Preservice & Cert/Licensure - More alignment with IHEs. Need to offer licensing specific to EC.

Preservice – Articulation between 2 and 4 year colleges. Will 4 year accept 2 year credits.

Higher education programs-- better linkage between what goes on in the state and linkage to higher education, in terms of professional development. Figuring out how EI/ECSE fits in with ECE.

Higher education programs to provide preservice training:

Support around the collaborations, connections and involvement with the higher education programs

Part B – Ongoing, Systematic and Effective Professional Development In-Service Opportunities

Other needs?

To look at more viable and feasible options other than the traditional face-to-face format for how in-services can be provided giving the very strenuous caseload.

Maybe some support around providing trainings to make sure the teachers (direct service providers) in the field understand what they need to do in early literacy and numeracy.

Is always seeking information assistance and TA is an issue-based, need-specific project (e.g., seeking resources when revising the regulations).

And then systematic approach to PD

Need assistance in tying together all the pieces into a comprehensive, coordinated effective system. We had a very strong system and are in the process of revising it and bringing it back. We need it and we know we do!

TA in the following areas would be beneficial: Systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities-- Have something at the state level, where resources could be shared and utilized (by EI/ECSE contractors, as well as with ECE community)

Ongoing systematic professional development in-service opportunities

Ongoing systematic professional development in-service opportunities

Ongoing, Systematic and Effective Professional Development In-service Opportunities

Ongoing, Systematic and Effective Professional Development In-service Opportunities (face-to-face)

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Need to build the a more systematic infrastructure for the amount of in-service trainings provided.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities

- Now happening in the state is that we have a cross-sector professional development group that is looking at all professional development provided for the B-5 practitioners.
 - We receive some outside assistance to try to set up an infrastructure at least for the B-5, so that we can have consistent coursework, whether it is pre-service or in-service.
 - We are trying to set up registries for the people taking the coursework and the trainers so we know they are qualified trainers and are appropriately trained in what they are teaching.

Although we already received some TA, it will be good to receive help on how to get it work into the infrastructure so it can be sustained.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Interested in expanding the use of remote training (e.g., web-based) in an effective and accountable way

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Might be helpful to have some support around the professional development, in-service opportunities, because a lot of what we provide is really directed toward the “middle management” folks (e.g., coordinators).

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

If we are not pursuing Race to the Top, we can use more TAs in having collaborative work in professional development and high-quality workforce across agencies and across department (e.g., child care, private and public preschools, Head Start, Part C and Part B 619).

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Want to know if there are other things/topical areas that we are missing – what can we do to make things/teacher preparation better?

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

We need to look at this more closely.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Finding technical assistance and developing training that are relevant across the diversity (e.g., different backgrounds, different level of knowledge and skills).

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

The “systematic” part of professional development in-service opportunities certainly is a need.

Part B – A Data System for Personnel Employed in the Part B 619 and Part C Systems

Data system is a need- how to link up data systems with other systems is something KY struggles with. For example PD 360 is a system used more in K-12 that we have available for preschool its just a matter of linking it to other systems and making it work.

Data Sharing

Data Systems - How do we get these different data systems to talk to each other? Look at outcomes that start in Part C and where are they by 3rd grade and what did they get along the way.

Data System

A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part C/B system that includes the above:

We are creating an early childhood longitudinal data system for Race to the Top. There will be a portion of that that is specific to the personnel in our program.

Part B – Recruitment and Retention

OTHER: Recruitment and Retention

Highest area of need is a better way of assuring there are enough practitioners for districts. Seems to be a disconnect between linking graduates of higher education programs with district programs that need licensed practitioners.

Part B – Practices

Other needs?

Next priority is preschool least restricted environment at supporting co-teaching and appropriate assessments, and IEP development for children in age 3-5.

Stay updated with new practices.

OTHER: Looking at quality practices for practitioners

Part B – Technical Assistance Availability

The primary issue is the lack of available staff and limited funding. Have a great team and the driving need is funding for more positions. Would welcome any TA but main area is infrastructure for doing more with limited funding.

TA in the following areas would be beneficial: TA availability

TA (how to best provide TA with very limited staff and resources)

TA availability

Technical assistance availability

Part B – Evaluation

Review of the professional system in general will be helpful, but nothing stands out as the priority.

Evaluation

Always open to more information about evaluation—struggle with knowing TA/training is actually improving child outcomes.

Evaluation – To find out if TA is actually changing practice

Evaluation

Evaluation

Evaluation

Evaluation

Evaluation-- Would be nice to have something more comprehensive and cohesive, but needs to fit into other systems being developed at the same time.

Evaluation:

Limited capacity in doing follow-up and providing feedback (coaching is a good way for follow-up, but do not have the capacity to do that).

Evaluation:

Teacher evaluation, especially for those that are the exceptions to the system we have.

Evaluation:

Would not say this is a strength. It is more informal. May not be an overall strength and need to work on a little bit more.

Evaluation:

Impact evaluation: After practitioners receive training, whether the training leads to any changes in the practice.

Evaluation:

- The evaluation piece – the impact of the training on practice (ongoing impact evaluation).
 - We now are trying to focus on ways to evaluate that and the shift that practitioners have to make in order to provide that intervention consistently.
 - We provide guidance on multi-level of evaluation, depending on the level of the training provided.
 -

Evaluation:

- Impact evaluation
 - What changes does our professional development have at the practitioner and at the student level (if the teachers and students are making changes)?
 - Come up with some guiding questions.
 - Longitudinal follow-up to measure long-term effects
 - Better measures that are not huge but sensitive enough to detect the changes

The evaluation of our strategic plan (there is an evaluation component in the plan).

Part B – Dissemination

TA in the following areas would be beneficial: Dissemination

Dissemination

Dissemination

Dissemination—currently not systematic across state

Dissemination

Dissemination:

An area of need.

Dissemination:

Currently we do not have a formal system for dissemination. May be a problem at this time.

Dissemination

This work will be part of the new center as well.

Dissemination:

I am trying to build things as systematic and multi-modal, and widely disseminated.

Part C – Recruitment and Retention

Recruitment and retention

Preservice availability and recruitment in early childhood special education are a need for personnel who have a solid background in early childhood special ed

Recruitment and retention

Recruitment and retention

Other needs?

- Recruitment:
 - Salary
 - Collaborate with other Northeastern states (cross-board training)
- Personnel preparation committee (courses, talk with the students)

OTHER: Recruitment and Retention (huge need)

Would take technical assistance in any area because Idaho currently does the best it can with what it has, but there is a high need for a structured comprehensive plan, with measurements for outcomes and success.

Part C – Practices

The secondary is scaling up the use of evidence-based practices in Part C

OTHER: More information and research on the evidence base around service coordinators (e.g., job description, criteria regarding how service coordinators should function, effective and validated practices)

If a new best practice comes up, we might need some assistance around that.

Have done well with contract agencies that provide services

Other needs?

Implementation sciences/implementation fidelity.

Other needs?

Scale up what we learn from working with the national TA centers (e.g., CELL and TACSEI).

Assess provider practices / competencies including service coordinators. "How do we know they are doing what they should be doing?"

Part C – Everything

- Additional Needs Identified:
 - Overall need for figuring out how EI/ECSE fits into the larger system of early childhood professional development in the state (e.g., accessing scholarship money, stipends, incentives).
 - Identifying and problem-solving around roadblocks so that EI/ECSE and ECE professional development can be integrated rather than parallel systems.

Other needs?

A comprehensive professional development system that leads to implementation fidelity that leads to a system change as the outcome.

Other needs?

We work closely with NERRC on these, but it will be great to have another resource to get additional information.

“Everything”

Part C – What Other States are Doing

TA - Some states like us use another University for TA -How/where do they (University T/TA agencies) get their learning and their PD? As a system we should be supporting them like -Training for TA centers - How can they learn from each other? Webinars for our TA folks to be a part of (use of technology, learning from other TA centers).

Other needs?

Interested in the other things other states of a comparable size are doing.

Part C – Ongoing Needs Assessment

Needs Assessment

Needs assessment

Needs Assessment & Evaluation – EI Credentialing system

Ongoing needs assessment and evaluation: Outcome is for all personnel working in EI to have and understand of how they are provided, rights, service plan & components, family driven. We have a way to do that with some personnel but not all.

Ongoing needs assessment-- assess how to best utilize limited resources by focusing the trainings and TA on the identified needs of programs.

Ongoing Needs Assessment

Ongoing Needs Assessment—currently in a transition process with this.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

One of the needs that we identify across the board is “family engagement” and “writing meaningful and measureable outcomes”. We started to address that in our CIS conference in May. Try to identify expert in the field because sometimes peer to peer support is more powerful than bringing in a guest speaker.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

Might be a good thing to know about the guidance other states are giving for needs assessment.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

No formal needs assessment.

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities:

Ongoing needs assessment of a CSPD overall (collecting information on a regular basis).

Ongoing needs assessment for all personnel serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities

Part C – Appropriate Licensing and Certification

Certification - How do we address certification for all EI staff without over burdening licensed professionals. How do you set up something that assures you that they have some kind of competence in EI? Do they know what they are doing when it comes to young children and families.

Certification - Certification process for FSC. Would be helpful to learn what other states are doing around this topic.

Certification – Considering certification for FSC

Licensing & Certification - 619 ECSE endorsement - shortage of teachers (serve both in school district classrooms and in the community)

May need to look at certification differently for our Developmental Therapists in the home

Appropriate licensing and certification:

The challenge in Vermont is: Anybody who has a teaching license will go work in the school system because the pay is significantly higher.

Part C – Higher Education Programs to Provide Pre-Service Training

Higher education programs to provide preservice training:

Increase early childhood experience for some specialties.

Higher education programs to provide preservice training

Higher Ed programs to provide preservice training

The primary area of need is working with IHEs to determine what is in place, what resources are needed, and how to implement supports.

Collaboration with related services preservice

Preservice & Needs Assessment: Teacher prep programs – how prepared are grads for EI and Are all IHEs covering EI well? IHE fieldwork sites need high quality & up to date natural environment practices.

Higher education programs-- better linkage between what goes on in the state and linkage to higher education, in terms of professional development. Figuring out how EI/ECSE fits in with ECE.

Higher education programs to provide preservice training:

Need a better linkage with IHEs (how to engage IHEs).

Higher education programs to provide preservice training:

Work with higher education programs: Influence the course content.

Higher education programs to provide preservice training:

Adult learning challenges.

Part C – Ongoing, Systematic and Effective Professional Development In-Service Opportunities

Other needs?

One of the needs that we identify across the board is “family engagement” and “writing meaningful and measureable outcomes”. We started to address that in our CIS conference in May. Try to identify expert in the field because sometimes peer to peer support is more powerful than bringing in a guest speaker.

In-service - Finding links to PD that other states have and are willing to share. High quality stuff.
Resource library that states could link to. IFSP training - developing good outcomes; assistive tech, OM, etc.

Other needs?

To look at more viable and feasible options other than the traditional face-to-face format for how in-services can be provided giving the very strenuous caseload.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities

Ongoing systematic and effective professional development

In-service – Need guidance for sustainable systems

In-service – Need a systematic approach to Personnel Development

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities-- Have something at the state level, where resources could be shared and utilized (by EI/ECSE contractors, as well as with ECE community).

OVERALL: Before thinking of areas where support is needed Nevada needs help in figuring out how to develop and support a system, especially in building a technological infrastructure to use in carrying out and monitoring professional development.

OVERALL: Need support in building a CSPD system, beginning with envisioning what it is that Hawaii wants and needs, figuring out how to get there with existing barriers (e.g., funding).

- Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities
Due to lack of funding there are very limited opportunities for different types of in-service trainings.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Interested in expanding the use of remote training (e.g., web-based) in an effective and accountable way.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Part of the current situation is because of insufficient staff and insufficient funding.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

Develop relevant trainings and TAs based on people's experience working with young children as opposed to their specialization areas.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

This is a priority for Part C.

Ongoing, systematic and effective professional development in-service opportunities:

For Part C, it is also not as systematic, and probably not sufficient.

Part C – A Data System for Personnel Employed in the Part B 619 and Part C Systems

Data System – interest in trying to establish an EC data system across agencies and programs ... in the beginning stages; don't know what kind of impact that would have in terms of gathering other information for our early childhood system for children with disabilities

Another area is a database for the CSPD as a whole to include all providers and the staff.

Data system

Data system

Data System to track personnel licensure / ongoing PD

Workforce Database System

A data system for the teachers that include EI professionals (because of Race to the Top we are working on one). Can use some help.

A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part C/B system that includes the above:

Focus on improving the Early Learning management system – create a better tracking system.

A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part C/B system that includes the above:

Data would be helpful in bringing people together and improve communication.

A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part C/B system that includes the above:

- CT is one of the states that will be working with the DaSy Center.

A data system for personnel currently employed in the Part C/B system that includes the above:

I have the list of Part C personnel who work in the state but not the data system.

Part C – Technical Assistance Availability

Technical assistance availability

Is there a way to provide TA to all providers / program level? Can't do a bunch online and have a way to shoot something out to everyone to get information from all providers.

Technical assistance availability--Biggest need is in building the technological structure to support trainings (e.g., web-based).

Technical assistance availability:

Hope to develop more capacities to offer a lot of options.

Part C – Evaluation

Other needs?

More interested in the evaluation/assessment of the overall CSPD system than in each of the components: Put together a system for that.

Evaluation of PD

Evaluation

Evaluation

Evaluation of CSPD process

Evaluation – We need help trying to get staff development / TA product developers to think about implementation. How are they going to measure the outcomes of this staff development/TA?

Evaluation of CSPD – Need kit / tools that would help states think about what might be involved in evaluation

Evaluation - need more comprehensive system

Evaluation

Evaluation-- Would be nice to have something more comprehensive and cohesive, but needs to fit into other systems being developed at the same time.

Evaluation--To help evaluate programs that are currently out there, as well as monitoring any professional development activities that are developed.

Evaluation

- Evaluation

Need a way to help assess whether or not trainings provided have a positive impact on Hawaii's system.

- Evaluation—

- Have developed a Fidelity of Implementation tool in conjunction with ECTA.
- The current need is to help people see how to use the tool as both an evaluative tool and a self-assessment tool, and how to connect that up with monitoring.
- Want to be responsive to folks needs but make sure there is a standardized message, and help people understand there is a reason and rationale for collecting data, so it can inform effectiveness of TA efforts.
- Looking at developing webinars or modules to meet knowledge requirements.

Evaluation

Evaluation:

Impact evaluation: Folks do not have immediate supervisors to do a reflective model (interactive activities) for training.

Evaluation:

We are open to evaluation ideas (impact).

Evaluation:

Impact evaluation: After practitioners receive training, whether the training leads to any changes in the practice.

Evaluation:

- The evaluation piece – the impact of the training on practice (ongoing impact evaluation).
 - We now are trying to focus on ways to evaluate that and the shift that practitioners have to make in order to provide that intervention consistently.

We provide guidance on multi-level of evaluation, depending on the level of the training provided.

Evaluation:

Impact evaluation (impact of training, follow-up).

Evaluation

Part C – Dissemination

Dissemination

Dissemination (Website) online presence for resources

Dissemination

Part C – Funding

Other needs?

Would like to have more funding.

APPENDIX D

Part B – Pre-service

Interested In looking at and flashing out the competencies for service coordinators, and creating credentials or something that are specific to that.

Add some infant toddler requirements to the pre-service programs (in the TA process and encourage programs to add more infant toddler component.

“Boot Camp” – Alt licensure program to quickly get SPED teachers into the classroom.

We have a Higher Education Task Force that is in the process of developing all of this information [preservice programs]. On the committee there are University people who are developing and teaching the EC courses.

No undergrad ECSE programs in the state

SPED minor is all that is required for our preschool (619); not very detailed

Part B – Recruitment and Retention

Schools have behavior analyst services available but not governed under Dept of Ed.- shortage of providers. Services for autism is another need- school districts can provide general services (e.g., behavior management, language therapy) but not specialized – (there are only a few specialized centers).

We have new positions and we are re-developing job descriptions

Recruitment (especially SLP) Need a review of what we can do and “is there really a problem?”

Recruitment is an issue – school districts pay more than CDC

Dire situation with recruiting & retaining SPED teachers -- conflict between high standards / highly qualified (i.e. state wants them to have a dual certificate) yet we have a significant shortage

Shortage of PT and SLPs -- Tele-help opportunities (rural state - spend a lot of money on travel)

Also shortage for PT and SLP - None of the programs in IHE for SLP have an evening program – need more flexibility.

Recruitment and retention is not addressed at the state level.

Recruitment & retention (lost a lot of personnel after Katrina especially in rural areas; also challenging to recruit personnel (especially related disciplines) to work with b-5 rather than with other populations. Doing a good job broadly with special education, but struggle with recruiting personnel for preschool special education

Part B – Professional Development System

More programs using our ECO / outcome data- to drive their instruction. Some programs are doing well and others are struggling. Many teachers have AA degrees - so they have not had IHE coursework - so we train them through Results Matter to look at data to drive instruction.

Struggle with the more time and resource-intensive supports - (coaching/mentoring) to get change to happen—state doesn't have the resources for that.

Beginning to explore distance coaching

What are some good models - training for our therapist in that coaching model.

We give CDCs \$ for training and they do what they do PD on their own (nothing formalized)

MTSS at the preschool level. The State Personnel Dev Grant is an MTSS grant and we have not incorporated preschool in it yet - 4 more years and would like to incorporate MTSS into the SPDG

We are starting over with our RFP for PD so we are looking at making PD needs based and improving outcomes for students. Preschool is one of our state initiatives.

We have (ECPPD) EC Partnerships Personnel Development for 8 and under; both Gen Ed & SPED

Want to use technology better for more effective and efficient PD. Working with Larry Edelman.

In Washington there are nine, regional, independent educational service districts that have legislative accountability and authority. A big component of their mission is around professional development and training. A group focused on early childhood education meets monthly

Face-to-face trainings have been beneficial in the past, may be difficult to switch to completely web-based.

Switching to web-based professional development, face to face training contracts have gone away.

Professional development system is coming along. Arizona has been intentional about making sure there is good representation from Birth-8, so that EI/ECSE can be a prominent part of the professional development system. Want practitioners to be aware of what they should know, and also want to understand how what support professionals need to be successful in their jobs.

An ongoing, systematic and effective PD system is an area of need.

PD Needs

Preschool outcomes assessments is a need. We could use some TA regarding the research base in assessments for both natural environments and traditional assessment; helping people be not so polarized and use EBP. DD have to have a new dx by age 8.

Part B - Standards

PK Standards with training component & curriculum guide

Did not know about the licensing information regarding BCBA. Indicated that Ms. Mary Keenan will be the person to ask.

Jerri will know about the BCBA and Orientation and Mobility Specialist license, and provide the information you need regarding license/certification.

BCBA: No state-level certificate. We do not endorse the certificate and do not provide recommendations. If a school district needs the personnel, they can hire the personnel and set the requirements at the local level. We provide guidelines and give guidance if the school district decides to hire the personnel.

Early Learning Network is working on a specialized licensure on inclusion

Coaching Certificate – Are other states doing it?

Providing inclusive options for children with disabilities is an ongoing issue in Nevada, particularly in rural areas. Dual licensure would help assist with this problem.

Thinking about the differences in practices between infants-toddlers and preschool. May promote an infant toddler certificate

Independent licensure board – not connected to them. “I don’t even know who to call”

Part B - System (includes Race to The Top)

Transition to school districts is hard (CDC to Elem)

With our 619 folks, one of the topics we are trying to focus in on now are the eligibility piece (e.g., the type of tools that are being used for eligibility, how is eligibility being determined) and the whole IEP process (e.g., the present level of development, IEP process and the development of good and measureable goals).

Recently started a collaboration with the special ed technical assistance project (for 6-21)- part of the funding is from 619 for them to provide TA on inclusion on kids with disabilities in regular ed settings (ISTAC and StarNet are working together).

We have an EC Group that involves SPED, Missouri Preschool Project, and Title 1. Trying to develop some guidance for districts for how they can blend and braid funds to expand their capacity to provide EC services for more kids.

Preschool LRE - LRE varies regarding where children are served. Majority of programs do not have peer models in the programs.

Comprehensive system connected with some other programs and trainings but there is still a disconnect. Haven’t quite connected with the special needs component (they focus more on poverty, abuse, not disabilities). Working to do more inclusion in the early childhood preK to make sure kids with disabilities are included in revised standards, etc.

TA Support for us: QRIS - what is going to be included?

Oregon is in a state of movement regarding early childhood education right now. Early childhood systems as a whole are a priority.

RTT – focus is on Kindergarten entry assessment development and Early Learning Development Standards;

In the process for applying for RTT Early Learning Challenge grant

In the process of writing a Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant and looking at how to integrate the Early Learning Leadership Networks from birth to 8 to build capacity within districts and increase PD efficiency and effectiveness.

Oregon has a Race to the Top Grant—Part B 619 & C are included on the grant and participate in the TA calls through that grant.

Right now getting support to help us just get to the table for the RTT - we are making in-roads.

Focus of Race to the Top Grant is on inclusive settings rather than on improving special education sites, want focus to be on all sites. Right now Part B 619 & C are working on figuring out how professional development would look as a shared system. It is currently very murky.

619 Coordinators need to network and support each other more (Part C networks through MPRRC)

Getting all of the entities together on the same page (child care providers, sped teachers, EC teachers, Head Start teachers, etc). We have so many hands in the pot that everyone is just doing their own thing. There is nothing uniform.

We don't know what other states are doing. Every state is just doing their own thing (re. What are their expectations for ESC? Qualifications for teachers in preK? How do they align training for all of the stakeholders to work together?) We need guidance or some way to "check-in" or some kind of

framework at the National level to follow, like a "marker." Need some alignment with other states across the US.

Changing political landscape has created some uncertainty

We spend a lot of money on travel.

Part C – Professional Development System

Consider the levels of TA, we may not be the most needy one – may be chosen at a lower level of TA.

Beginning to explore distance coaching

TA that would support coaching and mentoring of Therapists is high priority

What are some good models – training for our therapist in that coaching model.

Therapists need to learn how to work with ITDS and ITDS need EI specific content so they are equal to the therapists in knowledge and skills

TA system needs to address how to get therapists into the parent implemented coaching approach, how to work with teams, how to see the value of parent child interaction. They need to learn to value family engagement, Social Emotional development and Tier 1 & 2 training for ALL children

Lack of preparation to evaluate children aged birth to three.

Time for professional development in addition to work.

Our main need will be for training modules and more of a model that is EB than what we do currently

Would like to develop a web-B7 training modules for ECSE and related service providers for best practices

CDCs provide their own training or send people out for training

Difficult to provide a systematic approach to professional development training since there is no single approach to early intervention adopted across the state, approaches are more eclectic and multifaceted.

Focus of Race to the Top Grant is on inclusive settings rather than on improving special education sites, want focus to be on all sites. Right now Part B 619 & C are working on figuring out how professional development would look as a shared system. It is currently very murky.

Pulling PD committee back on track – need to go beyond being reactionary

PD Needs

IFSP process – rushed and don't have the time for 1.5 hour RBI, thus poor intake and parent concerns

Helping ECE understand that EI/ECSE does have evidence-based practices, which can be utilized within ECE.

We need to change the knowledge base for the team to work as a team... therapists need to learn more about families and Part C services. ITDS need to expand their knowledge of teaming too but also content to support complex needs of children and families

Need more functional goals

Part C – Pre-service

Hope to get Race to the Top so we can have seed money to potentially offer 4 to 6 college level courses that EI folks can take to fulfill the requirements.

Providers performance/effectiveness depends on the level of preservice a person comes in to EI with. Effectiveness of the credentialing system? There is a big difference between having a high quality knowledge base regarding EI and just needing information on the technical EI process vs. someone who needs a lot more than that with ongoing support [mentoring/induction]. It seems like it is overkill for some and then not enough for others.

Higher ed faculty do not know Part C services as well as needed to support the transition to coaching.... Insufficient information is offered on the Part C specific approaches to either educators or therapists

Dream would be to have a specialized early childhood track, or something similar, for personnel (e.g., OT, PT, SLP), so that they not only have the required licensure, but an understanding of evidence based practices in early intervention.

Add some infant toddler requirements to the pre-service programs (in the TA process and encourage programs to add more infant toddler component).

For those who come from the clinical arena, the IHE needs to better prepare them in working with infants and young children with special needs.

Part C – Standards

Infant Mental Health – myth that we don't serve kids with SE delay – high need

Infant Mental Health is not licensed at the state level. The U of Wi Madison offers a certification program. Personnel who have gone through program are now mentors

The state is considering developing an infant mental health specialist credential, and is examining other states credentials.

Brought in the Michigan endorsement for infant mental health specialist.

For infant metal health, my program helps to fund a full-time mental health coordinator (birth to five) for the state. This person has been in place for about a year and a half. She is housed in the VCU center and works through it. Her name is Bonnie Grifa.

To work in the field of EI, you really need to understand families and community resources. A teaching certificate is not enough (may be a great vision when rolling out the teaching certificate in the late 80s/early 90s).

Chart crosswalks or links between EI service, provider discipline, and qualifications

In Nevada reciprocity can be difficult regarding EI/ECSE licensure and endorsement, Nevada does not always honor training that has occurred in other states, so personnel from other states may be required to enroll in additional programs/courses.

Struggling with the process of the appropriate certificate/endorsement for Part C personnel.

- a. Not as rigorous as some states (e.g., Massachusetts, Texas). Those states specify the coursework, credentials and competencies for Part C personnel.
- b. Massachusetts has a well-established standard and is competency-based.

Early intervention personnel have higher standards (serving infants/toddlers and provide home-based and community-based services) than early childhood special education personnel.

Interested in looking at and flashing out the competencies for service coordinators, and creating credentials or something that are specific to that.

Coaching Certificates – Are other states doing it?

Thinking about the differences in practices between infants-toddlers and preschool. May promote an infant toddler certificate.

Would really like to see a way to build in a system for EI Certification in Hawaii

For some disciplines that we are not able to find information:

- a. BCBA/BCaBA: Yes, there are standards.
 Infant mental health: No. Adopted from Michigan.
- b. This is considered as an endorsement or credential, but we encourage people to get this.
 - i. 4 different levels.
 - ii. A reflective supervision model is used (usually about a year); however, the supervisor does not need to be credentialed.
 - iii. Part C helps sponsor part of the fee, but only for a year. The practitioner may have to pay out of pocket if go longer than a year.
 - iv. Cost several hundred bucks.

No BCBA – but have behavior specialist (psychologist).

Part C – Recruitment and Retention

In our state, those who work in the field of EI are social workers, nurses etc.

Provider shortages

We need TA for recruitment and retaining our therapists and teachers.

Shortage of PT and SLPs – Tele-help opportunities (rural state – spend a lot of money on travel)

Recruitment and retention is a big need for us. We can't pay Part C providers enough! They can make much more money going to work for school-age. We are really struggling with getting related services.

Retention & Recruitment (OT, PT, SLP, ECSE)

Recruitment & retention

Recruitment and retention - getting agencies to pay higher salaries, how to keep good personnel; Salary is an issue for service coordinators. Chronic shortage of PTs - pre-service programs do not graduate very many. Other shortages have to do with location (especially in rural and mountainous areas).

Recruitment and Retention is an area of need. Recently administered a retention survey of staff to gain information about who they are, why they came to work in early intervention, and how long they are going to stay. The next step is to analyze the data to determine how to improve recruitment and retention.

Part C – System (include Race to The Top)

We spend a lot of money on travel.

Any idea around the evaluation of CSPD system would be helpful.

It would be great if your center can establish a community of practice for people to share what they are doing in their states and share resources.

Everything! We need everything. Everything else is under Education, but we are under Dept of Health.

Partner with infant mental health professionals

Since there are fewer players within the Alaska system, it is easier to coordinate with one another.

Importance of supporting Part C and Part B 619 programs as they collaborate with larger early childhood health and development program.

Helping them collaborate together as partners and move away from “parallel play.”

Interested in seeing what other states are doing.

How can we connect Part C & B?

How can we incorporate what each agency is providing? How can we work collaboratively with them? Some agencies are more forthcoming with providers that are struggling. It is kind of hit or miss about how much information we get. Coordinators know there is support from the state for them.

It would be great to learn how other states are managing their PD process (i.e. online calendars, online courses – how did you set that up) links or examples or who would you go to. Don’t want to have to reinvent the wheel.

Poor family involvement

“Conversion plans” – plan to document how IFSP team will transition to LRE/natural environments

Recent initiatives – service delivery model – from vendor/independents to team. 100% of all new families on teams as of this summer. Logistics part is done – now we want to measure quality. How are the teams performing, not just who they are or where they are located?

With our 619 folks, one of the topics we are trying to focus in on now are the eligibility piece (e.g., the type of tools that are being used for eligibility, how is eligibility being determined) and the whole IEP process (e.g., the present level of development, IEP process and the development of good and measureable goals).

We need help with outcomes – and collecting data; we need staffing outcomes. We are just behind the 8 ball. Many other states are farther along.

Inclusion initiative through UNC-Chapel Hill (Mississippi Expanding Opportunities)

Need support in going toward natural environment

Can't get the lead agency to back us. If we had more power to do what needs to be done, our quality would improve greatly. "Providers sign voucher agreements saying that they will comply in these areas – sign and date them. And when they break those agreements we won't allow us to enforce any consequences on those programs. So everyone knows we have no teeth to enforce the policies that we already have."

State ICC is not helpful – negative; and gov is not very supportive

We have a strategic meeting in November (11/7) to develop a 3 to 4 year strategic plan regarding Part C to help us address these issues and stay compliant to the regulations.

Therefore, it is a more diverse structure than if it were a single entity hiring and setting the requirements for all personnel.

TA support for us: QRIS – what is going to be included/

New office designated by the gov., Office of Great Start, to coordinate and house many of the early childhood systems. Beyond the DoE they also coordinate with other early childhood initiatives across other state agencies.

Oregon is in a state of movement regarding early childhood education right now. Early childhood systems as a whole are a priority.

That is why California has a lead agency (Department of Developmental Services) over all of Part C in California. Then the California Department of Education acts as an administrative partner for the implementation of services.

Important to note that California took to heart the requirements under IDEA Part C (comprehensive, interagency set of services), system was built on existing providers.

Applying for RTT.

Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant- working along with Part B on data system (but not specific to CSPD)

Oregon has a Race to the Top Grant – Part B 619 & C are included on the grant and participate in the TA calls through that grant.

If we get Race to the Top, we are looking at full implementation and working with the existing early intervention in three years.