Welcome to the Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) Leadership Program Handbook. This Handbook is designed to describe the various components of the program, as well as guide you in the planning of your doctoral studies. The Handbook is divided into the following sections:

I. Description of the rationale that underlies services for infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children who are disabled or at risk and their families, and the philosophical perspective that underlies the EI/ECSE doctoral training program.

II. Description of the Early Intervention Program. The EI/ECSE doctoral program is part of the Early Intervention Program (EIP). The EIP has its own philosophy, organizational structure, and faculty, and contains a number of programs and activities including this leadership program. These various programs are interrelated and contribute to the EI/ECSE doctoral program.

III. Overview of program, goals, and training model. The goal of this leadership program is to prepare doctoral students to provide leadership in the area of EI/ECSE. Program participants graduate with the expertise to fill the following roles: Program developer, policy developer/analyst, applied researcher, and instructor.

IV. Description of program procedures and components, student evaluation, and policies. This section of the handbook contains an overview of program procedures and describes the apprenticeship model. It also contains descriptions of the seven program components which include course work, field work, leadership qualities, competency areas, professional activities, comprehensive examination, and dissertation. The program’s evaluation procedures and student policies are described in this section as well.
V. College of Education and Early Intervention Program student policies. This section of the handbook contains a set of policies that are particularly relevant to students in the EI/ECSE doctoral program.

Since much of what you need to know to successfully complete the EI/ECSE doctoral program is contained in this handbook, you are encouraged to familiarize yourself with its contents. Use it as a resource to prepare and plan your graduate program.
I. Rationale for Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education and Philosophical Perspective Underlying EI/ECSE Leadership Training

Theoretical Assumptions

The development and delivery of educational, medical, and therapeutic services for young children who are at risk and disabled is supported by two sets of theoretical assumptions: one set for the field of EI/ECSE and a second set for EI/ECSE programs and personnel training.

As shown in Figure 1, the two theoretical assumptions underlying the rationale for early intervention include: (1) Genetic, biological, and environmental problems can be overcome or attenuated (Werner & Smith, 2001); and (2) Early experience is critical in shaping children's development (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). Data suggesting the plasticity of the nervous system, the resiliency of the young child, and the influence of the environment on human organisms provide strong support for these theoretical positions. In addition, there is a broad range of empirical support for the effectiveness of early intervention for at-risk and disabled populations of young children and their families, if programs are conceptually sound and services are delivered by qualified personnel (Brooks-Gunn, Duncan & Aber, 1997; Farren, 2000; Odom & Wolery, 2003; Ramey & Ramey, 1992).

Also shown in Figure 1 are the three theoretical assumptions that underlie EI/ECSE programs and personnel training: (1) Children with developmental problems, and/or who live in poor environments, require specifically designed early experiences to help compensate for the genetic, biological or environmental deficit; (2) Trained personnel are necessary to provide essential early experiences to compensate for developmental problems and poor environmental stimulation; and (3) Developmental progress is enhanced in children who participate in EI/ECSE programs (Bricker, 1989; Farran, 2000; Guralnick, 1997).
Theoretical assumptions underlying rationale for Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education

Genetic, biological, and environmental problems or deficits can be overcome or attenuated

Early experience is critical in shaping children’s development

Children with developmental problems and/or who live in poor environments require specially designed early experience to compensate for the genetic, biological, or environmental deficit.

Trained personnel are necessary to provide essential early experiences to compensate for developmental problems and poor environmental stimulation.

Developmental progress is enhanced in children who participate and whose parents participate in Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education programs.

Figure 1. Theoretical assumptions underlying the rationale for Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education and for EI/ECSE programs and personnel preparation.

Philosophical Perspective Underlying EI/ECSE Leadership Training

The EI/ECSE leadership program described in this handbook is guided by five major philosophical perspectives, including 1) transactional, 2) family systems, 3) developmental, 4) educational, and 5) team/agency partnerships.

1. Transactional Perspective

The transactional or interactional perspective is a variation of the ecological model that is focused upon the social responsiveness of the environment and the interactive nature
of the child-environment exchange (Sameroff & Chandler, 1975; Sameroff & Fiese, 2000). The child's growth and development are the sum of the actions to, and reactions from, the environment over time. Consequently, concern must extend to children and their impact on the environment as well as the reverse. In addition to the emphasis on the reciprocal aspects of the interaction between child and environment, the transactional model reinforces attention to the importance of the child's social environment. The child's early exposure to the environment is largely mediated by primary caregivers. This social mediation is of importance and should be a focal point for interventionists interested in facilitating the development of infants and young children who are at risk and disabled (Sameroff & Chandler, 1975).

2. Family Systems Perspective

As the transactional perspective suggests, family involvement is considered fundamental to the success of early intervention with infants and young children. To be effective with infants and young children, personnel must begin to formulate their input based on the larger social context in which the family resides. Many authors have articulated the need to take into account the resources, stresses, values, and desires of family members before developing elaborate intervention plans which families may find unsuitable or even distasteful (Brink, 2002; Bronfenbrenner, 1976; Dunst & Trivette, 1990; Mahoney & Filer, 1996; Slentz & Bricker, 1992). Intervention efforts with children who are disabled are significantly enhanced when the primary caregiver receives adequate support, and when the parents, in turn, receive adequate community support - whether from extended family members, organizations (e.g., church), or friends.

The transactions that occur between caregivers and children should likewise be placed in the larger context of the family. The family is recognized as the focus of early intervention efforts in order to facilitate child change. The importance of the home environment, the social supports available to the family, and family characteristics are factors to be studied (Erickson & Kurz-Riemer, 1999; Pretti-Frontczak & Bricker, 2004). The family's strengths and needs must be carefully considered when implementing early intervention services.
3. Developmental Perspective

Developmental theory provides a general description of normal development during infancy and early childhood and the application of general developmental theory is enhanced by the skill theory perspective. That is, domains of behavior are a composite of individual skills. Skill acquisition follows a developmental hierarchy that moves from a simple concrete level, to the representation level, to the level of abstraction. A skill sequence develops relatively independently to certain levels at which time coordination between skills, or clusters of skills, occurs. The skills that develop and the speed with which they are acquired are dependent upon the environmental emphasis and input. Developmental theory provides general maps of emerging behavior. These maps are based on data that suggest the typical patterns of development for the young child in the domains of motor, cognitive, social-emotional, and adaptive behavior. Developmental hierarchies should be viewed as composites of sequentially acquired skills that guide most early intervention efforts (Hansen, 1996). Such a framework specifies long-range goals and also suggests intervention sequences. However, skill sequences provide only general guidelines and many children who are disabled will deviate from the typical pattern, as well as show a variation in acquisition rates across skill areas.

4. Educational Perspective

Another perspective underlying personnel leadership training is an educational orientation. An educational perspective encourages the interventionist to focus on arranging environmental contingencies in order to produce change in the child and family (Gargiulo & Kilgo, 2000; Noonan & McCormick, 1993). This perspective requires that education be defined in its broadest sense and does not refer exclusively to programming of skills more traditionally thought of as academic (e.g., reading and writing). Rather, “educational” refers to any skill or behavior that can be acquired through some form of environmental manipulation. Thus, most interventions formulated by allied health professionals appropriately fall under this definition of education.
The above definition of education requires that a broad array of domains be considered as potential intervention targets. Working in tandem with an orthopedist and physical therapist to assist a child in learning to properly use a prosthetic device would be considered an educational goal. Similarly, assisting a mother in acquiring more effective parenting strategies would be considered within the purview of education. Even assisting the family in acquiring social services that might indirectly impact on the care of the child would be considered educational, and thus an appropriate target within the present approach.

5. Team/Agency Partnerships

Quality services for infants and children and their families who have a range of needs require the cooperation of parents and professionals from many disciplines and agencies. If children are health impaired, medical or nutritional assistance may be necessary. If the family is neglectful, social service or legal agencies may need to be involved. If the child's development is delayed, educational or therapeutic services may be essential. Increasingly, the children and families being served in EI/ECSE programs have multiple and often chronic needs. To meet these needs, EI/ECSE personnel must have a team/agency perspective that encourages and promotes collaboration and cooperation (Bowe, 2004; Bricker & Widerstrom, 1996; Mahoney, Spiker, & Boyce, 1996).
II. The Early Intervention Program

Introduction

The need for qualified personnel in early intervention has been emphasized at national and state levels. The leadership training program described in this handbook was developed to respond to the need for highly trained individuals who can provide a broad range of services for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers who are at risk and disabled, and their families. The purpose of this training program is to prepare doctoral level personnel to provide leadership in the field of EI/ECSE. This program graduates leaders who are able to conduct program design and implementation, policy development and administration, training at institutions of higher education, and applied research and program evaluation. Preparation for these roles is acquired through a cohesive and coordinated set of course work and field experience offered by this training program.

In this section of the handbook, the larger organizational context for the EI/ECSE doctoral training program is described.

Organizational Structure

The College of Education has four academic areas and seven research institutes. The four areas include Counseling Psychology and Human Services, Teacher Education, Special Education, and Educational Leadership. The Early Intervention major is located in the Special Education area. The research institutes include the Center on Human Development, Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior, Educational and Community Supports, Center on Teaching and Learning, Behavioral Research, Training Center for Educational Policy Research, and Center for Electronic Studies.

The Early Intervention Program (EIP) is also part of the Center on Human Development (CHD), one of the major university research institutes. The Center on Human Development houses a number of major research and development projects, which are externally funded and focus on individuals with developmental disabilities and risk
populations from infancy to adulthood. In addition, Early Intervention is a part of the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD). The UCEDD provides coordination, program direction, and support for the Center on Human Development in four primary mission areas: (1) interdisciplinary training; (2) model development/exemplary services; (3) technical assistance; and (4) dissemination and outreach.

The Early Intervention Program offers personnel preparation, demonstration, research, and dissemination activities focused on populations of infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children who are at-risk and disabled, and their families. Early Intervention encompasses an interdisciplinary field of specialization that combines theory, research, and the application of recommended practices from fields such as early childhood, psychology, medicine, sociology, and special education.

**Early Intervention Program Faculty**

The EI/ECSE Leadership Program is composed of Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education core content and related support area content including: Allied health, school psychology, communication sciences and disorders, counseling psychology, special education, educational policy and management, and program development/evaluation. A broad range of faculty from these related areas is available to students in this program. These supporting faculty offer courses, advising, and opportunities for collaboration on demonstration and research projects.

**Director:** Jane Squires, Ph.D., Professor

Dr. Jane Squires has an extensive background in the delivery of services to children who are disabled. Dr. Squires teaches master’s and doctoral level graduate courses in EI/ECSE and advises students. She serves on the Dean’s Research Council and as a consultant to the Early Intervention Section, Oregon State Department of Education. She has worked with state level planners throughout the nation to develop child find and monitoring systems. Dr. Squires is actively involved in outreach and research projects involving Head Start, Early Head Start, and substance-exposed newborn populations.
She also serves as the Associate Director of the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD).

**EI/ECSE Core Faculty:** Jane Squires, Jantina Clifford, Linda Albi, and Liz Twombly.

**Jantina Clifford, Ph.D.** Dr. Clifford is an assistant professor at the University of Oregon. She earned both her Master’s and Doctoral degrees from the Early Intervention Program at the University of Oregon. Dr. Clifford teaches graduate courses in Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education, and provides training throughout the nation on the use of the *Ages and Stages Questionnaires* (ASQ), a system to screen infants and children who are at risk for developmental delays, and the *Ages and Stages Social-Emotional Questionnaires* (ASQ:SE), a screening tool focused on social-emotional behaviors of children between the ages of 3 months and 5 ½ years.

**Liz Twombly, M.Ed.** Ms. Twombly’s areas of training, research and teaching include developmental and social-emotional screening of young children, and the inclusion of parents in all aspects of their young child’s education. Ms. Twombly also provides training throughout the nation on the use of the ASQ and the ASQ:SE.

**Linda Albi** Ms. Albi serves as a practicum supervisor coordinator and has a Master’s degree in Early Intervention from the University of Oregon. She currently oversees practicum placements and supervises students in the Early Intervention Master’s Program. She also conducts research and evaluation in the area of personnel preparation.

**Core College of Education Faculty**

Core faculty are drawn from several areas in the College of Education. They are Rob Horner, Special Education; Beth Stormshak, Counseling Psychology; McKay Sohlberg, Communication Disorders and Sciences; Ken Merrell, School Psychology, and John Miller, Counseling Psychology and Human Services.
Key Support Areas

Special Education
Special Education is the home area of EI/ESCE. Faculty and students in the EI/ECSE area work closely with the faculty in the Special Education area. Doctoral students are able to participate in a variety of useful courses and research seminars which include single-subject research design, research on behavior and conduct disorders, and design of instruction.

Allied Health
The Child Development and Rehabilitation Center (CDRC) is located in the Center on Human Development, University of Oregon, directed by Marianne Taylor. CDRC staff includes nurses, social workers, psychologists, communication specialists, motor specialists, and a variety of medical specialists who offer course work, field experience, and advising for EI/ECSE doctoral students. CDRC is the primary state-supported diagnostic and evaluation unit for central and southern Oregon for children and youth with disabilities and thus is a rich resource for students interested in assessment, diagnosis and interdisciplinary teamwork.

School Psychology
Graduate students in the School Psychology program are able to specialize in Early Intervention, and may take EI/ECSE courses and practicum. Conversely, EI/ECSE students can access the School Psychology faculty, courses, and practicum. This collaboration may lead to joint projects benefiting both EI/ECSE and School Psychology students.

Communication Disorders and Sciences
The Communication Disorders and Sciences (CDS) faculty has a history of collaboration with the EI/ECSE area. Graduate students in the CDS program are encouraged to take courses and practicum in the EI/ECSE area. Interactions and interchanges between
CDS and EI/ECSE students in course work and practicum are profitable for both groups and help expand their interdisciplinary perspective.

**Counseling Psychology**
Liaisons have been forged between the Counseling Psychology faculty and the EI/ECSE program. The increasing need for cooperation and collaboration across professionals and agencies requires that more attention be given to the development of more effective listening, communication, and collaboration skills. Courses and practica experiences offered by the Counseling Psychology faculty are available to EI/ECSE doctoral students.

**Educational Leadership**
The area of Educational Leadership has much to offer EI/ECSE students. Courses and field experience address educational foundations, operation, and contemporary trends in public education. Sampling from this area provides students with a broadened perspective of public policy and regulations, as well as opportunities to participate with and learn from individuals preparing to enter educational administration.
III. Program Overview, Goals, and Training Model

Program Overview

The primary goal of this interdisciplinary EI/ECSE training program is to graduate professionals who can provide leadership in the area of EI/ECSE. This program offers a non-categorical, competency-based interdisciplinary course of study designed to train faculty for institutions of higher education, applied researchers, policy analysts, and program developers capable of leading and advancing the field of EI/ECSE. The program content is designed to assist the student in developing necessary competencies and leadership qualities.

The competencies and leadership qualities are acquired through participation in selected course work and professional activities. Course work includes: Core courses focused on early intervention and preschool disabilities, tool courses which include statistics, research design/methodology and computer skills, foundation courses, electives, and dissertation.

The field experiences for doctoral candidates revolve around preparation for the four basic roles of: 1) program developer, 2) applied researcher, 3) instructor, and 4) policy developer and analyst. The program is designed to assure that every graduate becomes competent in executing these four roles; however, depending upon a student's background or interest, one role may be emphasized over the others.

The intention of this program is to provide doctoral candidates with as much individualization in terms of their academic pursuits as possible; therefore, rather than structuring an immutable course work and field experience sequence, students develop an individual plan for their program of studies.
Program Goals

The goal of the EI/ECSE leadership program is to prepare doctoral students to provide leadership in the area of infants and young children who are at-risk and disabled, and their families. Specifically, students are prepared to fulfill the four roles of program developer, instructor, researcher, and policy analyst.

1. Program Developers, Implementers, and Evaluators

To accomplish this objective, students must successfully complete course work requirements and training activities that prepare them to develop innovative programs, expand existing programs and provide technical assistance to enhance the effectiveness of existing educational and social services.

2. Applied Researchers

Students should be both consumers and producers of quality research. Students are expected to acquire basic design and research skills that will allow them to develop quality research proposals and implement applied research strategies. Students must also develop the skills to critically analyze research data and relate its value and relevance to applied settings.

3. Instructors

If students are to become effective instructors in higher education settings, they need the knowledge and skills to develop high quality courses in EI/ECSE. The preparation and delivery of lectures is considered an important academic skill. Further, students must develop skills to advise and supervise undergraduate and Master's level trainees in field-based practicum settings as well as communicate effectively with the professionals conducting business in these settings (Acheson & Gall, 1997; Gallacher, 1997).
4. Policy Developers and Analysts

If students are to assume leadership roles in policy development/analyses, they must gain knowledge and skills in state-of-the-art concepts and procedures for delivering quality services. Of special importance are the skills needed to coordinate multiple agencies involved in educational and social service delivery. In addition, developing skills to manage public agencies during periods of financial austerity is of importance. Finally, doctoral students are expected to develop skills that are needed to assist in policy development at the state and local levels to ensure that the mandates of IDEA, CAPTA, and other legislation are implemented in a positive and effective manner.

Underlying these four roles is the assumption that doctoral students will develop a general knowledge of EI/ECSE, and the necessary scholarly skills that permit thorough knowledge of the fields and areas of related importance and critical analyses of available literature.

**Apprenticeship Model**

To meet the goal of this leadership program and to assist students in acquiring the four specific roles of program developer, policy analyst, instructor, and applied researcher, the program faculty employs a general approach to training called an apprenticeship model. According to Brown, Collins, and Duguid (1989), the apprenticeship model:

> Supports learning in a domain by enabling students to acquire, develop, and use cognitive tools in authentic domain activity. Similarly, craft apprenticeship enables apprentices to acquire and develop the tools and skills of their craft through authentic work at, and membership in, their trade (p. 39).

We believe the apprenticeship model is appropriate for learning to use a range of communication and social-interaction skills as well as cognitive skills.
An underlying foundational concept of the apprenticeship model is that effective learning occurs as a function of active involvement and participation. This assumption appears particularly important in academic settings where information too frequently is imparted through lecture to the passive student. As with small children, adults appear to acquire new or expanded knowledge and skills that they can subsequently use in an effective manner by actively engaging in the desired behavior rather than being told about the behavior in written or spoken words. However, it is important that the apprentice be given effective models for the behavior and timely feedback and guidance as he or she performs target behaviors.

As used in this leadership program, the apprenticeship model has three important features. First, the apprenticeship model requires that students have the opportunity to engage in a broad array of "authentic" activities. Authentic in this sense refers to actual activities in the real world. To be a competent program developer, the student needs to have been involved in actual program development activities such as developing an annual budget, understanding and putting in place an organizational structure for a program, hiring personnel, and conceiving and executing an evaluation plan. Authentic research skills might include writing a grant proposal, reading and interpreting agency/grant guidelines and regulations, designing a study, and collecting "real" data. The opportunity for students to engage in authentic activities provides them with many chances to acquire the necessary skills and information to fulfill the roles of program developer, policy analyst, instructor, and researcher.

A second feature of the apprenticeship model is that students can observe and work with individuals who meet the standards for successful leadership in the field of EI/ECSE. Providing authentic activities for students is greatly enhanced if successful and competent professionals are also engaged in the activity. For example, working with an experienced grant writer while engaged in developing a grant application provides the student with an array of opportunities to observe
how an experienced and successful professional engages in the process of problem solving and information gathering during the creation of an application. Working with seasoned and effective instructors as they develop their syllabi, order and prepare instructional material, deliver lectures, plan and execute learning activities, and conduct course evaluations can provide similar advantages to the student.

A third feature of the apprenticeship model is the feeling of membership in his or her profession that the student develops as he or she engages in the real activities of the profession. The student is not merely practicing or engaging in simulated activities, but rather is involved in the true essence of the field and learning to negotiate those activities that will assure his or her future success as a professional.

Using the apprenticeship model provides a broad and general framework for students to acquire the program's targeted leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities described in detail in the next section of this handbook.
IV. Program Procedures, Components, and Student Evaluation

This section of the handbook contains 1) an overview of program procedures, 2) a description of the seven program components, and 3) student evaluation procedures.

Overview of Program Procedures

Students can generally complete the doctoral program in four years. A List of the Procedures Leading to a Doctoral Degree is contained in Appendix A. The Doctoral Degree Checklist, which summarizes this information, is also contained in Appendix A. Students should familiarize themselves with the information contained in Appendix A so that they are aware of Graduate School and College of Education requirements and can meet deadlines in a timely manner.

Once admitted to the EI/ECSE program, students may select an academic advisor from the EI/ECSE faculty. At a minimum, students meet with their advisor at the end of each term to conduct an evaluation of the student's progress, discuss course work, and determine field-based activities for the following term. It is the responsibility of the student to schedule a meeting with their advisor, which enables them to plan and discuss ongoing as well as future activities. At the end of the second term of the student's first year, the student should have completed a tentative Doctoral Program Plan form and forwarded it to the Special Education Graduate Secretary. A blank Doctoral Program Plan form is contained on the following page and is also available on the College of Education web page.

Generally, during year one, students begin the basic statistical/tool courses and the EI/ECSE core courses. During year two, advanced course work is taken, and students begin to prepare for comprehensive exams. At the end of year two, students generally complete their comprehensive examinations. Following satisfactory completion of the comprehensive examination, students may begin their dissertation proposal. Years three and four are focused on completion of the dissertation and holding the oral defense.
Description of Program Components

The EI/ECSE doctoral program has seven components: 1) course work; 2) field work; 3) development of leadership qualities; 4) development of competency areas; 5) professional activities; 6) comprehensive exam, and 7) dissertation. Figure 2 shows leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities in relationship to training opportunities and leadership roles.

1. Course Work

Students are required to complete a minimum of 130 hours of course work beyond the bachelor’s degree including EI and research core courses, field experience, and research hours. Appendix B contains descriptions of EI/ECSE core courses. Incoming doctoral students will take core EI coursework, practicum, and methods during their first year as needed to acquire foundational Early Intervention skills.

College of Education Ph.D. students, including Early Intervention students, are required to complete a minimum of 18 hours of the research core courses shown in Figure 3. Fifteen hours of the Ph.D. research core must be selected from courses at Levels II, III, and IV. Dissertation hours, Readings and Conference 605 and Research 601 cannot be substituted for the 18-hour core requirement. Students are required to take a minimum of two linked courses in the following areas: Program evaluation, single-subject research, qualitative research, or quantitative/group research design. One course in each area must be from Level II and one must be from Level III (e.g., Qualitative Research in Education I, SPED 665 and SPED 666; Single-Subject Research Methods I, SPED 662, and Advanced Methods II in Single-Subject Research, SPED 607). The expectation is that the successful completion of two or more courses in an area, together with related applied work, will lead to establishing competence in the area; however, departments and programs are responsible for determining strategies to measure the student’s competence.

As shown in Figure 3, Level I contains three courses designed to be college-wide courses appropriate for Master’s and beginning Ph.D. students. Each of these courses
## Training Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Work</th>
<th>Practica</th>
<th>Research Projects</th>
<th>Dissemination Projects</th>
<th>Instructional Activities</th>
<th>Self-Initiated Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Leadership Qualities
- Evaluates Self Accurately
- Communicates Effectively
- Incorporates Feedback
- Shows Initiative
- Accepts Responsibility
- Makes Decisions
- Manages Time
- Solves Problems
- Offers Vision

### Competency Areas
- Knowledge of Special Education
- Knowledge of EI/ECSE
- Team Collaboration
- Assessment/Evaluation
- Supervision
- Clinical Intervention
- Program Development
- Policy Development/Analysis
- Instruction
- Research/Evaluation
- Writing/Dissemination

### Professional Activities
- Co-Teaches EI/ECSE Course
- Offers Inservice Training
- Supervises Licensure Students
- Evaluates Work Samples
- Conducts Program Evaluation
- Writes Grant Proposals
- Reviews/Critiques Journal Article
- Writes Journal Article
- Writes Policy Paper
- Conducts a Literature Review
- Completes Course Syllabus
- Conducts Data Analysis
- Participates in Ongoing Research
- Conducts Pilot Research Study
- Participates on Committee

### Leadership Roles
- Program Developer
- Applied Researcher
- Instructor
- Policy Analyst

Figure 2. Relationship of program leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities to training opportunities and leadership roles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Master’s &amp; beginning doctoral</th>
<th>Tests &amp; Measurements in Education (SPSY 617) 4 credits</th>
<th>Multimethod Inquiry in Education (SPED 664) 4 credits</th>
<th>Measurement in Decision-making (EDLD 642) 4 credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Beginning doctoral</td>
<td>Intro to Design &amp; Quantitative Methods (SPED 627) 3 credits</td>
<td>*Statistics in Education I (SPSY 618) 4 credits</td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>Single-subject Research Methods I (SPED 667) 3 credits</td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINTER</td>
<td>Single-subject Research Methods II (SPED 668) 3 credits</td>
<td>Advanced Research Design (SPED 607) 1-5 credits</td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td>Grant Writing (SPED 626) 3 credits * prerequisite SPED 607</td>
<td>Qualitative Research in Education I (SPED 665) 3 credits</td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>State and Local Policy Development in Education (SPED 683) 4 credits</td>
<td>Multivariate Statistics and Research Design (SPSY 620) 4 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Program Evaluation I (SPED 607) 4 credits</td>
<td>Qualitative Research in Education II (SPED 666) 3 credits</td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Program Evaluation II (SPED 609) 4 credits</td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Doctoral Advanced Topical Seminars Examples:</td>
<td>Action Research (EDLD 646)</td>
<td>Qualitative Research (EDLD 660)</td>
<td>Seminar Advanced Applied Behavior Analysis (SPED 624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar “The Role of Measurement in Educational Research (SPED 607)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Optional statistics series can be taken through Psychology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ONE</th>
<th>TWO</th>
<th>THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Research Requirements</td>
<td>Minimum of two consecutive courses in each of two research traditions (18)¹</td>
<td>Fifteen credits from levels II-IV</td>
<td>Dissertation (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Activities</td>
<td>Prof Seminar SPED 607</td>
<td>PROF Seminar SPED 607</td>
<td>Prof Seminar SPED 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Activity (suggested)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish program comm. &amp; develop program plan</td>
<td>File program plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>Advancement to Candidacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Unconditional</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Course requirements for college-wide Ph.D. research core.
is offered at least once each academic year. Level II contains five courses designed for Ph.D. students and these courses are offered annually. Level III contains four courses for Ph.D. students. Qualitative Research in Education II, Advanced Methods II in Single-Subject Research, Program Evaluation II, and Statistics in Education II are offered once each year. Level IV offers two advanced level doctoral courses that are offered at least once every two years. Level V offers topical seminars for advanced Ph.D. students. These seminars can cover a range of topics and are not necessarily offered on a regular basis. Course substitutions must be approved by the Department Head.

The purpose of the academic course work is to assure that students attain knowledge in the 11 program competency areas as well as have opportunities to complete some of the 15 professional activities.

2. Field Work

Field-based and other training opportunities are variable depending upon the student's prior experience and professional development needs. The purpose of the field work activities (e.g., supervision, research, instruction, program and policy development) is to assure that the student attains the program's leadership qualities and competencies as well as successfully completes the professional activities which are described in the next three sections.

The apprenticeship model used by EI faculty depends heavily on actual working experiences with the target populations; therefore field work is of critical importance. Students are required to enroll in field experience a minimum of 3 credits per term until completion of the comprehensive exam. Evaluation of performance on field work will vary considerably based on level of student expertise and type of field work. In general, students are evaluated by the assigned faculty member/supervisor. Students may customize their field work according to their needs and may also be asked to participate in advisor selected activities.
3. Development of Leadership Qualities

This program focuses on assisting students to develop nine leadership qualities, which include:

- **Evaluates Self Accurately**, which refers to objectively evaluating one's own performance across a variety of settings and seeking information about effectiveness from others.

- **Communicates Effectively**, which refers to making clear, organized, and logical presentations, responding appropriately to questions/issues, and understanding the pragmatic aspects of communication.

- **Incorporates Feedback**, which refers to seeking feedback from a variety of sources, considering feedback, and making adjustments in behavior as appropriate.

- **Shows Initiative**, which refers to seeking alternatives; generating solutions to problems; locating resources; going beyond specific requirements; and volunteering for leadership roles.

- **Accepts Responsibility**, which refers to carrying through on assigned tasks; assuring tasks are successfully completed; taking on additional responsibilities when necessary; and volunteering to share tasks.

- **Makes Decisions**, which refers to using strategies that successfully resolve problems; providing leadership; and decisions that are effective for self and others.

- **Manages Time**, which refers to successful completion of tasks and assignments according to set timelines.

- **Problem Solves**, which refers to deriving effective solutions to issues, problems, and challenges.
• **Offers Vision**, which refers to formulating and presenting solutions or strategies that others adapt and complete.

4. Development of Competency Areas

This program targets 11 competency areas, which include:

• **Knowledge of Special Education**
  Students are expected to develop general background knowledge and information in Special Education as a discipline. Such information and knowledge includes a history of Special Education, the relationship of Special Education to General Education, major educational and psychological theories of relevance to Special Education, and general content and perspectives that comprise contemporary Special Education and direct exposure to, as well as systematic instruction in, a behavioral-ecological approach to the service delivery process in special education. The competency is reached by requiring students to take at least 20 hours of course work in general Special Education. It is evaluated by having students take a written comprehensive examination.

• **Knowledge of EI/ECSE**
  Students are expected to acquire a broad array of information that will qualify them as experts in EI/ECSE. Such information would include knowledge of normal infant development, atypical development, curriculum, intervention approaches, family theory, family involvement, relevant research on normal children, children at risk and with disabilities, interagency cooperation, and interdisciplinary approaches. To reach this competency, students are required to take all EI/ECSE courses. It is evaluated by a written comprehensive examination.
• **Team Collaboration**
Students are required to take course work and practica focused on team training, and are provided with direct experience in both the content and process of the team service delivery model within an educational, health related, or medical setting. The purpose of this requirement is to provide students with the necessary information and skills to function effectively within an interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, or multidisciplinary setting. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.

• **Assessment/Evaluation**
Students are expected to be familiar with theoretical models of assessment and evaluation, and their application. A thorough knowledge of available child, family, and program assessment tools/procedures and their limitations is expected. Team-based approaches are emphasized. This competency is reached by students working with core and supporting faculty. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.

• **Supervision**
Students are expected to acquire the skills necessary to permit effective supervision of others such as teachers, students, and research assistants. Such skills include generic strategies for organizing and deploying personnel resources, managing ongoing intervention, diagnostic, or research activities, and providing evaluation and corrective feedback. This competency is reached by having students successfully complete directed supervision of Masters students. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.

• **Clinical Intervention**
Students are expected to acquire the skills necessary to permit effective clinical intervention. Such skills include the ability to change maladaptive behavior to more appropriate and/or functional forms in a broad range of children, youth, and adults, and across a wide range of diverse settings. This competency is acquired by students successfully completing at least six hours of practicum experience in direct clinical application. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.
• **Program Development**
Students are expected to acquire the necessary knowledge and skill to develop intervention programs. Such information/skills include developing feasible plans, hiring personnel, deploying staff, recruiting participants, organizing content, supervising delivery of services, and evaluating outcomes. This competency is acquired through course work and participation in model service delivery programs with core faculty. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.

• **Instruction**
Students are expected to acquire the skills necessary to permit effective instruction within a didactic mode (e.g., classrooms, workshops, presentations at professional meetings). Such skills include the ability to organize and present material in a variety of relevant areas for audiences of varying skill levels, evaluate the impact of the presentation, and make corrective changes as necessary. This competency is reached by having students team teach EI/ECSE courses with core faculty, independently teach a course, and participate in several inservice or outreach training activities. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.

• **Research/Evaluation**
Students are expected to acquire the skills necessary to become a discriminating consumer of research products and a producer of objective outcomes. Such skills include the ability to evaluate research in terms of its design, methodological flaws, and interpretation, as well as being able to design and implement objective data collection procedures and interpret the outcomes. This competency is accomplished by having students take at least 18 hours of course work in statistics and research design. Students must also work on research projects with core faculty and supporting faculty. This competency is evaluated by successful completion of a research project prior to the dissertation.
• **Writing/Dissemination**

Students are expected to acquire the skills necessary to write professionally effective documents. Such skills include the ability to formulate and write grant applications, manuscripts describing correlational and experimental research outcomes, clinical reports, and other related professional documents. This competency is reached by students successfully completing course work in which written papers are required and by writing of articles, papers, chapters, and grant applications.

• **Policy Development and Analysis**

Students are expected to acquire the information and skills necessary for translation of federal guidelines, research findings, and scholarly work into functional guidelines for developing and implementing direct intervention programs. Such information and skills are essential to understanding state-of-the-art policy concepts and translating them into applicable state and local guidelines, including development of specific procedures to assure proper interpretation. This competency is acquired by having students work with core and supporting faculty involved in policy development/analysis. Student performance is evaluated by his or her supervisor.

5. **Professional Activities**

To successfully complete the EI/ECSE doctoral program, students are expected to successfully complete 15 professional activities that include:

• **Co-Teaches EI/ECSE Core Course**

Students must co-teach at least one EI/ECSE core course with an EI faculty member. Students are responsible for revising the syllabus, selecting assignments, presenting the majority of the lectures, and evaluating students under the supervision of the faculty member. This competency requires proficient speaking skills. Alternative training and training activities may be substituted for non-native speakers.
• **Offers Inservice Training**
Students must participate in at least three inservice or outreach training sessions of a half-day or longer. Students are responsible for revising materials as needed, making presentations, and evaluating the outcome. Alternate training activities may be substituted for non-native speakers.

• **Supervises Licensure Students**
Students must supervise two or more licensure students for three or more terms. Students are responsible for weekly observations/meetings, providing helpful feedback, and evaluating the students’ performance. This competency requires proficient speaking skills. Alternative supervision activities may be substituted for non-native speakers.

• **Evaluates Work Samples**
Students must evaluate at least two teaching samples of licensure students. Students are responsible for providing accurate and helpful feedback on the teaching sample.

• **Conducts Program Evaluation**
Students must design and conduct an evaluation of an ongoing research, training, or demonstration program in EI/ECSE.

• **Writes Grant Proposal**
Students must write an independent grant proposal or a major portion of a joint proposal. Students are responsible for undertaking and meeting grant deadlines.

• **Reviews and Critiques Journal Manuscripts**
Students must complete at least three reviews/critiques of manuscripts being considered for publication in a professional journal.

• **Writes Journal Article**
Students must write an article potentially suitable for publication in an EI/ECSE or allied field journal. This activity may be one part of the comprehensive exam. The article may be in joint authorship with EI faculty, with the student taking the lead role. In order to develop
professional writing skills, students are strongly encouraged to seek writing opportunities by assisting faculty in writing grant applications, journal articles, final grant reports, and other materials.

- **Conducts a Literature Review**
  Students must conduct a comprehensive literature review of an EI/ECSE-related area. The review should include an analysis and critique of existing literature.

- **Completes a Course Syllabus**
  Students must complete a course syllabus for a course they will or potentially will teach that meets College of Education standards.

- **Conducts Data Analysis**
  Students must complete a data analysis on an existing data set. Students are responsible for assuring results are accurate.

- **Participates in Ongoing Research**
  Students must join an ongoing research effort for at least two terms. Students are responsible for fulfilling assigned role.

- **Conducts Pilot Research Study**
  Students must conduct a pilot research study prior to their dissertation. Students are responsible for designing the study, collecting, and analyzing the data, and writing up the results.

- **Participates on Committee**
  Students must participate on a departmental, college, or university committee for at least one year. Students are responsible for attending meetings and completing assigned tasks.
• **Writes Policy Paper (Optional)**

Students write an independent paper on an EI/ECSE-related policy or write up a policy analysis.

**6. Comprehensive Examination**

When students have completed two or more years of course work and practica, they typically write their comprehensive examinations. Students identify three or four areas to be addressed in preparing and writing their comprehensive exams. Areas should be broad enough to include major topics (e.g., family involvement in EI/ECSE; service delivery in EI/ECSE; assessment in EI/ECSE; history and current status of EI/ECSE), but not so broad as to be meaningless (e.g., families; early development; early intervention). Students may enroll for 1-6 credits of Reading and Conference during the terms they are preparing for their comprehensive exam.

The student then develops a comprehensive reading list and set of potential questions (3 to 6) for each selected area. The reading list should include important work that has been conducted in the area and can include position and research papers. The questions should address important areas and require breadth to answer. The purpose is for the student to demonstrate her or his comprehensive knowledge of the chosen topic.

The student then selects one of the areas to develop a journal manuscript. The article may vary in terms of rigor and direction depending upon the journal for which the article is being written. Authorship of the manuscript will usually include committee members who have assisted in revising the article. The manuscript is expected to address one of the questions posed under the area. An outline of the article should be developed including the following information:

- **Area**
- **Topic and specific question to be addressed**
- **Why this topic was chosen**
- **Intended audience**
Potential journals for submission
A brief description of the topic
Introduction
Purpose
Method
Results
Summary

The student’s comprehensive exam committee must approve the areas, questions, reading lists, and article outline. The student will write a sit down examination on the remaining two areas. The student will have an 8-hour day for each area and will answer two to six questions per area. Reference lists and brief outline may be taken into the sit down examination.

To assist in the preparation and completion of comprehensive exams, students should follow the procedures outlined below:

- Discuss tentative topic areas with advisor.
- Select members of comprehensive exam committee (adviser plus 1-2 other faculty members).
- Select three areas, write preliminary questions for two areas and develop a bibliography for each question. Write an outline for the article.
- Obtain approval of questions by advisor.
- Discuss questions and reading list with committee members, and incorporate feedback.
- Areas and questions are approved by committee.
- Set date for writing sit-down examination and for completion of article.
- Write exam and complete article.
- Program submits report on Comprehension Exam to Grad School.
- Graduate School sends student notice of advancement to candidacy after report is filed.
Upon completion of the two-day written comprehensive examination, the student’s comprehensive exam committee will independently evaluate the exam. The committee will independently assign a “pass with distinction,” “pass,” or “no pass” to each question. Committee members are not expected to provide a detailed critique of the exam, but will provide general feedback on the quality of the responses covering the following dimensions:

- Content coverage (i.e., historical background, current issues, major research findings, future directions),
- Organization and logic of response (i.e., the answer is organized so the reader can clearly follow major points which flow logically),
- Selection and synthesis of literature and research (i.e., the answer should convey a coherent synthesis of the literature/research, major issues, and challenges as well as a synthesis of material from different disciplines or perspectives), and
- Presentation (i.e., answers should be grammatical, with few word errors, and easily readable).

Following their independent evaluations, the committee will meet and compare their ratings for each question. Two “no passes” on a question constitutes a “no pass” for the question and requires a remediation procedure. Students must receive at least two “passes” per question in order to satisfactorily complete this portion of their comprehensive examination.

Remedial Procedures

For each question on which a student receives two “no pass” ratings, a remedial procedure is required. The student may select one option from the following three options:

- Develop new questions and complete a second sit-down exam,
- Write an extensive paper covering the failed content area (evaluation criteria for the paper are considerably more exacting than for the sit-down examination and include:
  - A comprehensive coverage of the area
  - Outstanding synthesis of the literature/research
• Publishable presentation), or
• Offer a third option for the committee to consider.

Whatever option chosen, the committee will again evaluate the product independently. Once evaluation is complete, the committee will meet and compare their ratings. The student must again receive at least two “passes” per question/paper.

If a question/paper does not receive at least two “passes” a second time, the student will be required to develop an action plan. The action plan will propose a set of remedial procedures to be undertaken by the student and will include:

• Taking additional relevant course work,
• Completing additional readings in the area of deficiency, and
• Setting a timeline for completion of the action plan.

The committee must approve the student’s action plan and timeline. A third failed exam as well as failure to comply with the action plan or timeline constitutes grounds for termination from the program.

When the student meets the stipulations of the approved action plan, the student may take his/her comprehensive examination for the third and final time. Failure to receive at least two “passes” per question/paper will result in termination from the program.

7. Dissertation

Students typically spend their final year completing their dissertation. While engaged in dissertation activities, students must enroll for dissertation hours (SPED 603) for a minimum of 18 credits. The dissertation procedure is outlined below. (Consult Appendix A for description of requirements and forms.)

A. Proposal Phase (approximately 1-3 months)
   1) Chairperson review
a) Present idea to chairperson  
b) Write draft and submit to chairperson  

2) Select Dissertation Committee  

3) Revise draft and resubmit  

4) Submit Human Subjects Compliance Protocol (Requires approximately 2-4 weeks).  
   a) Submit protocol to Department's Human Subjects Review Committee for approval.  
   b) Submit protocol to Human Subjects Compliance Office  

5) Proposal Committee review (Requires approximately 2-3 weeks)  
   a) Submit copy to each member  
   b) Meet with each committee member  
   c) Hold proposal meeting  

B. Dissertation data collection phase (time varies with each project)  
C. Data analysis and dissertation writing (time varies with each project)  
D. Dissertation completion phase (Time requirement is approximately 2-6 months).  
Consult the University Schedule to ensure you meet deadlines for dissertation and oral defense completion.  

1) Chairperson review  
2) Committee review  
3) File application for degree by deadline  
   a) Pay processing fee  
   b) Complete Request to Schedule Oral Defense form  
   c) Submit 4 copies of abstract to Graduate School  
4) Oral defense  

NOTE: No less than 6 months may pass between establishing the dissertation committee and the Oral Defense.
Student Evaluation Procedures

Students are responsible for successful completion of required course work and field experiences as well as program designated leadership qualities, competency areas, professional activities, comprehensive exam, and dissertation. Before the beginning of each term, the student and his/her advisor will complete four evaluation forms: 1) the Competency Areas Rating Form, 2) the Leadership Qualities Rating Form, 3) the Professional Activities Rating Form, and 4) Quarterly Professional Activities, Competency Areas, and Leadership Qualities Planning and Evaluation Form. The Competency Areas and Leadership Qualities Rating Forms are designed as matrices for ease in monitoring students' acquisition of targeted competencies and leadership qualities over time. The Professional Activities Rating Form provides space to enter the specific activity, the sign-off agent, and date. Copies of these forms are contained in Appendix C.

The Competency Areas Rating Form and the Leadership Qualities Rating Form are to be completed independently by the student and then reviewed with his/her advisor before the beginning of each term. These forms allow students and their advisor to monitor the student's needs and progress and to assist in the selection of pertinent courses and field experiences. Students, in conjunction with their advisor, select the competency area(s) and leadership qualities they wish to focus on each term. Selection is based on need or desire. For example, a first year student might concentrate on one competency area the first quarter and add more areas as the academic year progresses. Another student may enter the program with a wealth of experience and may be ready for three or four competency areas (e.g., policy development, writing, instruction). In addition, students should select those professional activities they plan to target for the term or year. Once the leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities are selected, students can complete the Quarterly Professional Activities, Competency Areas and Leadership Qualities Planning and Evaluation Form. Alternate forms may be developed by the student. Electronic versions of evaluation forms can be found in the EIP Hub on Blackboard.
At the end of each term, students review progress with advisor and complete the evaluation outcome, rating and recommendation sections of the Quarterly Competency and Leadership Quality Planning and Evaluation Form to assist in planning for the following term.

In accordance with the program training model, it is up to the student to seek and/or maintain the desired level of supervision and evaluation from his/her advisor. First year students may feel the need to meet more frequently with an advisor or may request more active supervision such as evaluation of written work, observation while teaching or presenting, or feedback on interpersonal interactions. Other students may feel that the minimum level of supervision, as stated above, will suffice. The student may build in the desired level of supervision into the Quarterly Competency and Leadership Quality Planning and Evaluation form, and state his/her expectations during each term’s initial meeting with the advisor.

The SPED Student Evaluation Procedures can be found in Appendix D.
V. College Of Education and Early Intervention Program
Student Policies

This section contains selected policies promulgated by either the College of Education or the Early Intervention Program of particular relevance to doctoral students.

Travel Policy to Support Conference Travel

The EI Program encourages its doctoral students to submit papers and posters and to make presentations at local, regional, state, and national professional meetings. To the extent possible, the program would like to offer financial support to students who have papers or presentations accepted at a conference, particularly national conferences. However, financial support for student travel is limited and therefore the following guidelines will be used to allocate travel monies to students:

- Students must have a paper/poster/presentation formally accepted to receive support.
- Students who have been supported for one trip while in the program can make a second request, but will be given low priority.
- Conference should have direct relevance to Early Intervention.
- If there are more requests than money, the money will be divided fairly across students requesting support.
- Students must book economical flights and make cost-effective hotel arrangements.

Human Subjects Research Clearance for Student Projects

Graduate students must have approval PRIOR to engaging in any research project involving human or animal subjects. This may include surveys, questionnaires, and interviews, as well as other sorts of physical tests or experimentation. It applies not only to thesis or dissertation research, but also to research for class projects and internships if there is a possibility that the data will be published or maintained for later use. Review committees are unable to give post facto approval.
A compliance form for a doctoral dissertation or other research project must be completed, signed, and on file in the Graduate School before data is collected. Failure to do so may result in a recommendation from the Research Compliance Officer to the Dean of the Graduate School that the university not accept a dissertation.

If students who are participating in a faculty research project are also going to collect independent data for their own degree research, they should be listed on the faculty Principal Investigator's protocol, with an indication of what information they will be collecting on their own.

Approval forms and instructions can be obtained on the Human Subjects Compliance website at: http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~humansub/

Research compliance is also described below.

**About Research Compliance on the UO Campus**

In accordance with the Federal Policy on the Protection of Human Subjects (DHHS policy 45 CFR Part 46, effective August 19, 1991), University of Oregon assumes the responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects who participate in research and other activity projects conducted by, or under the supervision of, faculty, staff, or students. To conduct this responsibility effectively, the University maintains a Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects/Institutional Review Board (CPHS/IRB) competent to review research, training, and other activity protocols involving human subjects and to evaluate both risk and protection against risk for those subjects. It is the function of the CPHS/IRB to 1) determine and certify that all projects reviewed by the CPHS/IRB conform to the regulation and policies set forth by DHHS regarding the health, welfare, safety, rights, and privileges of human subjects; and 2) assist the investigator in complying with DHHS regulations in a way that permits accomplishment of the research activity.
Division for Early Childhood
Code of Ethics
Adopted: September 1996
Reaffirmed: April 1999

As members of the Division for Early Childhood (DEC) of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), we recognize that in our professional conduct we are faced with choices that call on us to determine right from wrong. Other choices, however, are not nearly as clear, forcing us to choose between competing priorities and to acknowledge the moral ambiguity of life. The following code of ethics is based on the Division’s recognition of the critical role of conscience, not merely in preventing wrong, but in choosing among courses of action in order to act in the best interests of young children with special needs and their families and to support our professional colleagues.

As members of DEC, we acknowledge our responsibility to abide by high standards of performance and ethical conduct and we commit to:

1. Demonstrate the highest standards of personal integrity, truthfulness, and honesty in all our professional activities in order to inspire the confidence and trust of the public and those with whom we work;
2. Demonstrate our respect and concern for children and families, colleagues, and others with whom we work, honoring their beliefs, values, customs, and culture;
3. Demonstrate our respect for families in their task of nurturing their children and support them in achieving the outcomes they desire for themselves and their children;
4. Demonstrate, in our behavior and language, that we respect and appreciate the unique value and human potential of each child;
5. Strive for personal professional excellence, seeking new information, using new information and ideas, and responding openly to the suggestions of others;
6. Encourage the professional development of our colleagues and those seeking to enter fields related to early childhood special education, early intervention, and personnel preparation, offering guidance, assistance, support, and mentorship to others without the burden of professional competition;
7. Ensure that programs and services we provide are based on law as well as a current knowledge of and recommended practice in early childhood special education, early intervention, and personnel preparation;
8. Serve as an advocate for children with special needs and their families and for the professionals who serve them in our communities working with those who make the policy and programmatic decisions that enhance or depreciate the quality of their lives;
9. Oppose any discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, political affiliation, disability, age, or marital status in all aspects of personnel action and service delivery;
10. Protect the privacy and confidentiality of information regarding children and families, colleagues, and students; and
11. Reflect our commitment to the Division for Early Childhood and to its adopted policies and positions.

The Division for Early Childhood acknowledges with appreciation the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the American Society for Public Administration, and the Council for Exceptional Children, whose codes of conduct were helpful as we developed our own.

Permission to copy not required – distribution encouraged
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Doctoral Degree Checklist

This is a brief summary of the requirements and steps to a doctoral degree. Please note that a form must be filed at almost every step. Forms may be obtained from the program secretary or the Graduate School. For clarification, please contact the director or program secretary.

1. Program Approval- College of Education Requirement
   All doctoral candidates must file a Doctoral Program Plan approved by their advisor and/or program committee.

2. Establish Residency- Graduate school Requirement
   For the Ph.D degree, the student must complete at least 3 years of full-time graduate level academic work beyond the bachelor’s degree, of which at least one academic year must be spent in residence on the Eugene campus after the student has been classified as a conditionally or unconditionally admitted student in the doctoral program. One academic year consists of three consecutive terms of full-time study, with a minimum of 9 completed graduate credits per term.

3. Comprehensive Examination
   a. Students must have completed most or all course work before doing doctoral comprehensive exams.
   b. All doctoral candidates must complete a series of doctoral examinations per individual department requirements.

THE TERM YOU TAKE YOUR DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS, YOU MUST BE REGISTERED FOR A MINIMUM OF THREE GRADUATE HOURS, IF YOU WRITE YOUR EXAMS AT A TIME WHEN UO IS NOT IN SESSION, (DURING SPRING BREAK, ETC.), YOU MUST BE REGISTERED FOR THE PREVIOUS TERM AND THE FOLLOWING TERM.

After faculty have read and passed all sections of doctoral comprehensive examination, the student will be advanced to candidacy. They will be notified by receipt of a letter from the Graduate School.

4. Continuous Enrollment
   Doctoral candidates must maintain continuous enrollment. If the student does not wish to enroll for one or more terms, he/she must obtain an Application for On-leave Status from the program secretary or Graduate School, complete it and have it filed with the Grad School. On-leave forms are valid for a maximum of three terms, excluding summer. Once a student is advanced to candidacy, only three more terms are allowed for leave. After advancement, the doctoral student can register for no more than three terms of “In Absentia” at a reduced fee.
5. **Dissertation Committee**  
After advancement to candidacy, you must select a dissertation committee. The student must complete the “Dissertation Committee Appointment Form”, which can be obtained from the program secretary or Grad School. This form should be signed by the Department Head or Associate Dean for Academic Programs before it is filed with the Graduate School.

The dissertation committee consists of: Chairperson (must be from within your department), two inside members (from your own department), and an outside member (from outside the College of Education). All members of the committee must hold a doctorate degree and be from a doctorate degree-granting department. Exceptions to this rule can be made on an individual basis by review of the Graduate School.

THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE MUST BE OFFICIALLY APPOINTED AT LEAST 6 (SIX) MONTHS PRIOR TO THE ORAL DEFENSE.

6. **Dissertation Proposal**  
Each doctoral candidate must develop a dissertation proposal and hold a proposal meeting at least three months prior to the oral defense. Proposal Approval forms are available from the program secretary and are signed by committee members after the proposal meeting.

7. **Human Subjects Review**  
Any doctoral student using individuals for research must fill out a Human Subjects Compliance protocol to which a copy or draft of your proposal is attached. All research proposals must first be submitted to the College of Education’s Human Subjects Review Committee for approval before they are submitted to the University’s Office for Protection of Human Subjects. Human Subjects Compliance review procedures and packet are available from the program secretary or from the Office for Protection of Human Subjects at 346-2510. An electronic version of the form is available on the internet at: [http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/](http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/). Please note that there are deadlines each term for committee review.

8. **Conduct Research, Data Analysis, and Write Dissertation**

9. **Application for Advanced Degree**  
Preferably the term prior to, but no later than during the first two weeks of the term you will complete your degree, apply for your degree at the Graduate School. Deadlines can be found in the Time Schedule or by calling the Graduate School.

10. **Oral Defense**  
Determine a time, place, and date for your oral defense by coordinating with all your committee members. Fill out the “Confirmation to Attend Oral Defense” form, secure all signatures of committee members, and submit the form to the Grad School along with four copies of the signed Abstract (on 25% cotton bond paper) at least three-and-a-half weeks prior to your oral defense.
If a committee member is unable to attend the oral defense, pick up a copy of the letter necessary for the absent individual to submit along with the Confirmation to Attend Oral Defense form. REMEMBER: THE COMMITTEE CHAIR AND THE OUTSIDE MEMBER CAN NOT BE "IN ABSENTIA". ALSO, A DEFENSE MAY NOT BE HELD WHEN THE UO IS NOT IN SESSION (TERM BREAKS, ZERO WEEK OF SUMMER, ETC.).

11. Complete Dissertation Corrections Suggested by Committee, Submit Dissertation to Graduate School, and Make any Graduate School Corrections.

Early Intervention Core Courses

Research Issues in Early Intervention
SPED 607
Terms: Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer
This doctoral level course meets each term and focuses on a research topic or issue of importance to the field of EI/ECSE. Students assist in selecting topics and reading assignments and participate in weekly discussions.

Early Intervention Methods I, II, III, IV
Course Numbers: SPED 687, SPED 688, SPED 689, SPED 690
Terms: Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer
The methods courses are an integral component of student’s practica experiences. The content of methods courses includes administration of a criterion-referenced assessment for program planning; Individualized Family Service Plan and Individualized Education Plan development; Activity-Based Intervention, and ongoing group and individual progress monitoring. The year-long methods courses are matched with the requirements of the endorsement and applied in the practicum setting for real-life opportunities to learn the content of the courses. In addition, the methods courses provide a forum to discuss and reflect upon practicum experiences.

Application of a Linked System I and II
Course Number: SPED 607
Terms: Fall and Winter
Application of Linked System I & II is a series of courses designed to provide opportunities for students implement activities in their practica placements that will increase their understanding of a linked approach to providing early intervention services. The goal of the two-course sequence is to provide a foundation for the understanding of the components of the linked system, how they influence one another, and how they are implemented within a best practice model for early intervention/early childhood special education. Activities and assignments in both courses lead to the completion of one sample of evidence required by Oregon’s licensing agency, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC).
Foundations in Early Childhood and Early Intervention  
Course Number: EINT 680  
Term: Fall
The foundations class presents theories of child development and covers typical and atypical development across behavioral domains. There is an emphasis on observing children and defining their levels of functioning based upon developmental information.

Legal and social history is used as a backdrop for teaching the evolution of early intervention. Practices in early childhood education, early childhood/special education and early intervention and their implication for current practice are discussed. Current practices, including a linked systems approach, are also introduced.

Family-Guided Early Intervention  
Course Number: SPED 681  
Term: Winter
This course examines the history of parent and family involvement in EI/ECSE programs. Both historical and contemporary issues are identified and discussed. Particular emphasis is placed on including parents as partners in the assessment, intervention and evaluation of their child. Parental perspective is provided by guest lecturers who are parents of children with disabilities.

Assessment and Evaluation in Early Childhood and Early Intervention  
Course Number: SPED 682  
Term: Winter
Assessment and Evaluation in Early Intervention is designed to investigate the theoretical concepts of assessment and program evaluation in early intervention. Knowledge of assessment instruments, curriculum and instructional strategies, and program evaluation methodologies will be highlighted as well as applications to a variety of integrated intervention settings.

Curriculum in Early Childhood and Early Intervention  
Course Number: SPED 683  
Term: Summer
The Curriculum in Early Childhood/Early Child Special Education teaches the fundamentals of program planning for individual and groups of children. Popular curricula used in Early Childhood Education and in Early Child/Special Education programs are reviewed and evaluated. Curriculum-based assessment is introduced and frequently used assessments are reviewed. The philosophical focus is the link between philosophy, assessment, intervention and evaluation.