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Introduction to the Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Leadership Program Handbook

Welcome to the Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) Leadership Program. 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) within the Special Education and Clinical Sciences (SPECS) department. 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. International students. Information pertinent to international doctoral students is summarized in this section.

VI. 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 are supported by two sets of theoretical assumptions: one set for the field of EI/ECSE and a second set for EI/ECSE programs and professional development.

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; Squires & Bricker, 2007). 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; McCormick, Grooks-Gunn, Buka, et al., 2006).
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) professional/family, transdisciplinary 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; Squires & Bricker, 2007).

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; Cowan & Cowan, 2006; 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-Riener, 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, 2006). 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 functional 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. Professional/Family, Transdisciplinary 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 transdisciplinary 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 departments and seven research institutes. The four departments include Counseling Psychology and Human Services, Teacher Education, Special Education and Clinical Sciences, and Educational Leadership. The Early Intervention Program is located in the Special Education and Clinical Sciences department. 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 and Teaching, Center for Educational Policy Research, Child and Family Center, Secondary Special Education and Transition Programs, 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. The Early Intervention Program Core Faculty includes:

**Jane Squires, Ph.D., Professor/Director**
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 is director of the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) and serves on the 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 and in international projects in several countries including Chile, China, Scotland, Canada, and Thailand.

**Erin Barton, Ph.D.** Erin Barton received her Ph.D degree from the Department of Special Education, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN. She holds a B.S. in Human Development from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education from DePaul University in Chicago, IL and has served as a teacher of young children with autism, a teacher supervisor, teaching assistant, research assistant, and instructor of undergraduate courses. Specific research interests focus on developing and evaluating teacher in-service and pre-service development, teaching play skills to children with disabilities, measuring play behaviors, and serving young children with disabilities in inclusive settings, particularly children with autism.

**Jantina Clifford, Ph.D.** (University of Oregon, 2006). Dr. Clifford is an assistant professor at the University of Oregon. She has been an early Childhood Educator for 9 years and her interests include instrument development, and developmental issues of internationally adopted children. 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. (University of Oregon, 1991). 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, M.S. (University of Oregon, 1997). Ms. Albi is the Field Experience Coordinator and instructor of graduate level courses with interests in clinical supervision in EI/ECSE. Ms. Albi is a practicum and student teaching supervisor, and Director of BOOST (Building on Opportunities for Summer Teaching), the EIP summer preschool classroom.

Key Support Areas

Special Education and Clinical Sciences (SPECS)
Special Education and Clinical Sciences is the home department for the Early Intervention Program. Faculty and students in the EI/ECSE area work closely with the faculty in the SPECS department. 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. EI/ECSE is also within the Special Education (SPED) major area.

Child Development and Rehabilitation Center
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, including a joint personnel preparation program, Training Early Advanced Master’s Specialists (TEAMS). 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. Figure 2 (pg. 14) shows leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities in relationship to training opportunities and leadership roles.
Figure 2. Relationship of program leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities to training opportunities and leadership roles.
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; Pajak, 2006).
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 knowledge and skills that are needed to assist in policy development at the state and local levels to ensure that the mandates of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act (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. (pg. 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.

**Student Professionalism and Confidentiality**

Students are expected to adhere to program professional requirements and professional code of ethics. Students will be asked to complete university assignments within community placements and are obligated to maintain a strict code of confidentiality. Appendix A contains the Division of Early Childhood Code of Ethics statement and the EIP/COE parent consent form for working with children in community programs.

**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 checklist of the Procedures Leading to a Doctoral Degree is contained in Appendix B. Students should familiarize themselves with the information contained in Appendix B so that they are aware of Graduate School and College of Education requirements and can meet deadlines in a
timely manner. Special Education (SPED) requirements must also be followed, as described in Appendix B. SPED is the major area of study for EI/ECSE students within SPECS.

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 in Appendix B 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 written and portfolio 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.

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 C 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 Table 1. 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. Table 2 contains a suggested EI/ECSE schedule for statistics and graduate requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 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>Level II. Beginning doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>Intro to Design &amp; Quantitative Methods (SPED 627) 3 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>Single-subject Research Methods I (SPED 667) 3 credits</td>
<td>Philosophy of Research (TED 610) 4 credits</td>
<td>**Statistics in Education I (SPSY 618) 4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>Single-subject Research Methods II (SPED 668) 3 credits</td>
<td>Advanced Research Design (SPED 607) 1-5 credits</td>
<td>**Statistics in Education II (SPSY 619) 4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III. Advanced doctoral</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><strong>FALL</strong></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><strong>WINTER</strong></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><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>Program Evaluation II (SPED 609) 4 credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV. Doctoral Advanced Topical Seminars Examples:</td>
<td>Action Research (EDLD 646)</td>
<td>Qualitative Research (EDLD 660)</td>
<td>Seminar “The Role of Measurement in Educational Research (SPED 607)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item Response Theory (EDLD 661)</td>
<td>Seminar Advanced Applied Behavior Analysis (SPED 624)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Research (EDLD 660)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All doctoral students are expected to have completed the EI Master’s core courses

**Statistics series can be taken through Psychology
Table 2. Suggested Early Intervention Doctoral Program Activities Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR ONE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR TWO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum of two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses in each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of two research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditions (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fifteen credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from levels II-IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core EI courses</td>
<td>Core EI courses</td>
<td>Core EI courses</td>
<td>Core EI courses</td>
<td>Grant Writing SPED 626</td>
<td>Doc Seminar SPED 607</td>
<td>Doc Seminar SPED 607</td>
<td>Doc Seminar SPED 607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(suggested)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee &amp; develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portfolio review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete comprehensive exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Proposal &amp; portfolio complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance to Candidacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain dissertation funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 1, Level I contains three courses designed to be college-wide courses appropriate for Master’s and beginning Ph.D. students. Each of these courses 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.

Students in the College of Education can choose to earn a D.Ed. (Doctorate of Education) rather than the Ph.D. For students whose career goals include working in educational settings and conducting program evaluation and action research rather than experimental research, a D.Ed may be more appropriate. Fewer advanced statistics courses are required.

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

See Appendix D, page 63 for Leadership Qualities Rating Form
This program focuses on assisting students to develop nine leadership qualities, which include:

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

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

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

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

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

- **Makes Decisions**, using strategies that successfully resolve problems; providing leadership; and decisions that are effective for self and others.
• **Manages Time**, successful completion of tasks and assignments according to set timelines.

• **Problem Solves**, deriving effective solutions to issues, problems, and challenges.

• **Offers Vision**, formulating and presenting solutions or strategies that others adapt and complete.

4. Development of Competency Areas

See Appendix D, page 64 for Competency Areas Rating form.

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 the student’s advisor as well as the student’s written review of literature.

• **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 written work and coursework.

- **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 rigorous 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. The program committee determines the adequacy of writing skills during the comprehensive exam process.

• **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**
See Appendix D, page 61 for Professional Activities Rating Form
To successfully complete the EI/ECSE doctoral program, students are expected to successfully complete 15 professional activities listed below. The student and advisor evaluate adequacy of these activities.

• **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 or Concept Paper**
  Students must write an article potentially suitable for publication in an EI/ECSE or allied field journal. This activity is one part of the comprehensive portfolio 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. The Concept Paper should make a contribution to the professional literature or field and be suitable for submission for publication in a professional source. A contribution may be made by adding a new concept, idea, or theory to the field; by doing a new or unique review, synthesis, or analysis of the literature; or by proposing or addressing a new application, demonstration, or other use of the professional literature and knowledge base.

• **Conducts a Literature Review/Synthesis**
  Students must conduct a comprehensive literature review of an EI/ECSE-related area. The review should include an analysis and critique of existing literature. The topic should be different than the concept paper/journal article.

• **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. **Program Planning**

During a student’s first year in the doctoral program, he/she must establish a Program Committee and develop a plan that will be filed during spring term.

*What is the Program Committee?* The Program Committee (PC) is composed of at least two faculty from the College of Education, each of whom must (a) hold a doctoral degree, (b) engage in research, teaching, and service activities, and (C) regularly participate in activities related to doctoral training in the College of Education. The formation of the PC precedes the formation of the Dissertation Committee. Each committee has a different role.

*What is the role of the PC?* The PC is designed to provide each doctoral student with a structure and process for advisement regarding features of his or her graduate program relative to long-term professional goals. The PC also must approve the student’s graduate program plan, a primary component for completion of the doctoral degree. The PC also approves and evaluates the research design and concept and issues components of the Comprehensive Examination.
How and when is the PC formed? Throughout Year One, students should have regular contact with their program advisor to discuss program requirements, tasks, and timelines. At the end of Year One and with the assistance of his or her program advisor, each student has the responsibility of establishing a PC.

How often does the PC meet with the student? The PC meets at least three times: once when the student presents his or her program plan toward the end of Year One, once to evaluate Comprehensive Examinations, and once to review progress on the Competency Portfolio.

What is a program plan? Each student develops a plan that consists of four major components:

1. A goal statement that reflects the student’s (a) professional ambitions and objectives, (b) three areas of specialization (e.g., assessment, early literacy, transition, behavior support, infant mental health), and (c) a plan for achieving these objectives and developing these specialization areas.
2. A vita that summarizes the student’s (a) educational background (b) professional experiences, and (c) professional activities (e.g., publications, conference presentations, workshops and inservices, teaching activities).
3. A list of completed and proposed courses that support the student’s goal statement.
4. A plan for completing the Competency Portfolio including proposed activities, timelines and evaluation strategies.

How is the Program Plan presented and approved? With the assistance of his or her program advisor, each student develops a program plan and establishes a PC. At the first PC meeting, the student presents this plan and the PC evaluates the degree to which the students’ proposed program activities support achievement of professional goals and development of areas of specialization. The PC provides suggestions for enhancing the program plan. Upon approval, the program plan is signed and retained in the student file. A copy of the program plan can be found in Appendix B.
ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY- PURPOSE AND DOMAINS EVALUATED

The purpose of advancement to candidacy includes:

1. Providing Ph.D. students with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and expertise in specific areas of study.
2. Setting the occasion for Ph.D. students to integrate their knowledge and skills in professional activities related to their scholarship and teaching.
3. Evaluating Ph.D. students’ competence in their general and professional knowledge and their capacity to successfully conduct and defend a dissertation.

In preparation for advancement to candidacy, each doctoral student will be evaluated on the following domains: professional standards, scholarly communication, and educational inquiry through their completion of comprehensive examinations (competence and concept paper in core coursework).

Following is an explanation of each of these evaluation tools:

Comprehensive Examinations

What are Comprehensive Examinations? The purposes of comprehensive examinations are for students to demonstrate their (a) acquisition and fluency of core doctoral knowledge, (b) ability to organize and synthesize information, and (c) ability to communicate information in writing.

The comprehensive examination involves two primary components: (1) competence in core coursework and (2) competence in research design and scholarly writing as specified in the Competency Portfolio.

1. Competence in Core Coursework
   Satisfactory* completion of core EI/ECSE classes, research seminar (3 terms), and Level I research series.
   * Satisfactory is defined by a grade of B or better or a grade of Pass (P) in all courses.

2. Competence in Scholarly Writing
   What is the purpose of the Journal Article/Concept Paper? The journal article/concept paper should make a contribution to the professional literature or field and be suitable for submission for publication in a professional source. A contribution may be made by adding a
new concept, idea, or theory to the field; by doing a new or unique review, synthesis, or analysis of the literature; or by proposing or addressing a new application, demonstration, or other use of the professional literature and knowledge base.

**How is the Journal Article/Concept Paper evaluated?** The journal article/concept paper should satisfy the following criteria:

1. Approved by faculty members on the student’s PC.
2. On a topic other than the dissertation to provide breadth of expertise.
4. Addresses at a minimum the four following dimensions:
   a. Definition and description of problem/concept/issue
   b. Review and critique of literature
   c. Summary of status of problem/concept/issue
   d. Recommendation for future research or direction.

Products developed for previous courses may be used as a basis for the comprehensive examination requirement. Please note, however, that the criteria and evaluation of the product for a course may not satisfy the criteria for the comprehensive examination. Upon completion of requirements for the comprehensive examination, the student submits documentation certified with the faculty advisor’s signature.

**Using GradWeb to Process Advancement to Candidacy**

Either the student or the Academic Secretary can begin the Advancement process by using GradWeb. After logging in, choose the SPED major. Then click on Advancements (from menu across top of screen). Then choose Advancements in Progress (from menu on left side of screen). At the top of this next screen, you will see this sentence: “To start the process of advancement to candidacy for a student, please [click here].” This will take you to a new screen where you can fill in basic student information, such as name, ID#, address, etc. The Academic Secretary can log on and complete the rest of the form, which entails inputting dates that each requirement was completed, as well as the date that the committee reviewed and approved each requirement. This form is submitted online to the Graduate School for their review and decision whether to approve or deny the student’s advancement.
AFTER ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY

When students advance to candidacy, they are then considered “candidates” and can continue working to complete the remaining components of their Competency Portfolio.

Competency Portfolio

*What is the Competency Portfolio?* The Competency Portfolio must be completed by each student and represents an individualized collection of the students’ research, scholarly writing, teaching, and service activities. The specific manner in which each student satisfies each competency is developed by the student and his or her program committee. In general, the specific nature of each competency area program task is based on a consideration of the student’s professional goals and objectives. Any significant deviations from the competency portfolio expectations must be made in writing and approved by the Special Education Doctoral Committee.

*What are the required components and content of the Competency Portfolio?* Specific program tasks and evaluation criteria are distributed across 11 competency areas (see Competency Portfolio Plan and Completion Record).

*Who evaluates the Competency Portfolio and how is it evaluated?* Each competency area and program task is evaluated by a faculty member who is supervising and/or working with the student. Progress on the Competency Portfolio is monitored by the student and his or her advisor. Completion of the Competency Portfolio is monitored and evaluated by the student’s program committee (a) at the initial Program Planning Committee Meeting and (b) just after Comprehensive Examinations are completed. Each program task is evaluated as a high pass, pass, or revise, and is signed by a supervising faculty member only if a pass or better has been given.

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 B 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
      a) Three members within COE
      b) One outside member
   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) Oral Defense meeting/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

Dissertations should be presented to the Department of Special Education and Clinical Sciences. The department name is found on the Title page, the Approval page (ii), and the
Abstract (iii or iv). Due to the length of the department name, it will be necessary to follow the long department name format for the Title Page and the Abstract. Please see Chapter VIII of the Thesis/Dissertation Style and Policy Manual for examples of how to properly format long department names on the Abstract. The Thesis and Dissertation Style and Policy Manual is found on the Graduate School Web site at:
http://gradschool.uoregon.edu/?page=styleManualContents

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 D.

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.

V. International Students

Application

The Early Intervention Doctoral Program attracts students from around the world. International applicants need to submit the following in addition to the regular application materials:

a. Non-U.S. citizens applying to the University of Oregon need to submit the “Supplementary Application and Financial Statement for International Students”. Application forms can be found at: http://oip.uoregon.edu/iss/index.php.

b. Proficiency in English is vital to the academic success of international students. Students whose native language is not English must supply results of the Test of
English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) as part of the application process. A minimum score of 575 on the paper-based test or 88 on the internet-based test is required.

Admission
International students should request information from the Office of International Programs (OIP) about immigration and Naturalization Service regulations and minimum credit requirements. The OIP can be contacted at: 541-346-3206 or online at: http://oip.uoregon.edu/.

Financial Aid
International students may work on campus during the school year but should not expect to work off campus. Those who hold student (F-1) visas are expected to have sufficient funds for the period of their studies. Their dependents are usually not allowed to work. However, if it is necessary for a dependent to work, students should contact the OIP for assistance.

International students are eligible for teaching and research fellowships. Nonnative speakers of English who accept teaching-related Graduate Teaching Fellowships (GTF) must submit a score for the Test of Spoken English (TSE) or the Speaking Proficiency English Assessment Kit (SPEAK) to the Graduate School. Individuals scoring below 50 on the TSE or 230 on the SPEAK test must attend language support classes (at no additional charge to the student) and may be limited in their activities they carry out as Graduate Teaching Fellows.

Health Insurance
The University of Oregon requires that all international students and their families be covered by university-approved health and accident insurance. Registration for classes may not be completed until adequate insurance coverage is verified.
VI. 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. Appendix F contains the SPED Student Remediation, Retention, and Dismissal procedures; SPECS Policy on GTF Promotions; and the SPECS Student Funding Guidelines.

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://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/

**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.
CITI Training

The University of Oregon offers a web-based program referred to as CITI (the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative). All UO researchers and research personnel involved in human subjects research, regardless of whether the research is funded or non-funded, will be required to complete the CITI program before receiving approval for any new or continuing research protocol.

CITI is a web-based training product that was designed by, and is updated and maintained by a number of nationally known IRB professionals and is housed at the University of Miami. It is a comprehensive program offering up-to-date information on human subjects protection issues. Program content is regularly evaluated and improved. CITI is well-respected nationally, with many large research institutions relying on the program for basic training.

CITI is designed around topic-specific modules, each followed by a short quiz. The number of modules needed for completion depends on the "Learner Group" with which a person identifies. (See Learner Group questions under FAQs.) CITI does not have to be completed in one sitting. CITI is user-friendly and available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. The CITI certificate expires after two years. The CITI learner must then successfully complete a refresher course. To get started, go to: https://www.citiprogram.org.

Research Involving Human Subjects

All research projects in which human subjects participate, whether funded or unfunded, are subject to the federal regulations governing such research. When an investigator plans to conduct research involving human subjects, s/he would be advised to contact the Office of Human Subjects Compliance (HSC) as early as possible. Aspects of a project which may be problematic can be discussed and alternative procedures suggested. At this point, the research often can be designed in a way which will facilitate approval.
Determining Human Subjects Involvement

The initial determination as to whether a research project should be considered human subjects research should be made by the investigator. Investigators should consult HSC for advice on this question. Final authority for making this determination rests with the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects/Institutional Review Board (CPHS/IRB) or its designee.

In general, research which involves data gathered solely for internal, on-campus use would not need to be reviewed (e.g., classroom initiated research or training grants). If, however, the results of this research will be disseminated in any way, then the research must receive prior approval from the CPHS/IRB. If no dissemination is planned at the time the data are gathered, but the possibility of future dissemination exists, the faculty member/student would be advised to submit the project for approval prior to initiating the research. The Committee is unable to give post facto approval.

Graduate students must complete the Required Clearance for Master's Thesis/Project or Doctoral Dissertation form. The form documents CPHS/IRB review and approval and must be on file with the Graduate School before the data collection for a project begins. The form may be obtained from the Graduate School or the Office of Human Subjects Compliance.

Research Conducted Off Campus or Recruitment Performed Off-Campus

All research with agencies/schools requires written permission of the participating sites. Letters must be on official letterhead from participating agencies/schools indicating their willingness to participate in the research project and that they will "abide and comply with the University of Oregon CPHS/IRB requirements for the protection of human research subjects." Letters must be on file in the Office of Human Subjects Compliance before the project is initiated. International research needs documentation of permission from local authorities and/or research visa.
Review Categories

Proposed projects submitted to HSC are reviewed under one of two categories: Category I is eligible for exempt review and Category II requires expedited or full review. Each category has a separate protocol form. For exempt review, the HSC determines that the protocol is exempt under the federal regulations. If the protocol is satisfactory, HSC will approve the protocol and notify the investigator that the research may commence. Under both the expedited and full review, the protocol and supporting documents require a more extensive review by the CPHS/IRB. Expedited protocols will be reviewed by two members of the CPHS/IRB. If both reviewers approve the protocol, the chairperson of the CPHS/IRB will sign the cover sheet, indicating that the research may begin. However, if either reviewer does not approve the protocol, the protocol will be treated as a full review and referred to the CPHS/IRB for consideration at their next meeting. If a project is determined to require a full review, the protocol will be referred directly to the CPHS/IRB for review at the next scheduled meeting. Please refer to the Investigator’s Manual on Research With Human Subjects for a complete description of the CPHS/IRB full review process.

The review procedures for each of the review categories are described in the Procedural Summary Chart. Each investigator should make the initial determination regarding the appropriate category of review, although the CPHS/IRB or its designee may require review under another category. The researcher may always complete the Expedited/Full Review Packet if unsure of the category. Call HSC at (541) 346-2510 if you have questions regarding the review categories.

How to Contact the Office of Human Subjects Compliance
Most of the information and applications you need are on the web at:
http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/
Office of Human Subjects Compliance
Riverfront Research Park, Suite 106
5219 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5219  (541) 346-2510  FAX: (541) 346-5138
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Appendix A

Division for Early Childhood Code of Ethics Statement

Early Intervention Program Doctoral Parent Consent Form
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
Dear Parent,

My name is ____________________, and I am a Doctoral student in the University of Oregon’s Early Intervention Program. Each term, students in the program have the opportunity to apply what they are learning by working in a variety of early intervention programs within the community. This term I will be working in your child(ren)’s program, ______________________.

Many times I will be asked to complete University assignments within my community placement. Therefore, I am requesting your consent to work on the activities which I have outlined below. If you have any questions about the activities I have listed please do not hesitate to contact me at ________________ or at your child(ren)’s program.

I am obligated to maintain confidentiality and no information on your child(ren) or family will be released to other professionals, students, or other agencies without your written consent.

If there are any changes or requests, other than those described here, I will notify you directly. You are not obligated to have your child(ren) work with me, and if you should choose to allow the activities outlined below, you can withdraw your consent at any time. In general, the activities are designed to be incorporated into your child(ren)’s daily routine and should not alter your child(ren)’s program.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this request and I look forward to working with you and your child(ren).

Proposed Activities:

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________     ___________   ____________________     ________
Parent or Guardian’s Signature         Date   Student’s Signature         Date
Appendix B

Procedures Leading to the Doctoral Degree Checklist

Doctoral Program Plan
# 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. Insert date of completion of each step.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date completed</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1. Program Approval</strong>- College of Education Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All doctoral candidates must file a Doctoral Program Plan approved by their advisor and/or program committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Establish Residency</strong>- Graduate school Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Comprehensive Examination/Portfolio Completion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Students must have completed most or all course work before doing doctoral comprehensive exams/portfolio requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. All doctoral candidates must complete a series of doctoral examinations per individual department requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4. Continuous Enrollment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 (pg. 35-36).

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/. 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. |
Name______________________________________________________________________________

Date of filing program____________________

PH.D._________ ED.D ________ Major ________________________________________________

Advisor’s Name _____________________________________________________________

Program Committee (if applicable) ______________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

Date of Expected Degree Completion _____________________________________________

**Student Signature** ___________________________________________________________

Date __________

**Advisor Signature** ___________________________________________________________

Date __________

**TERM**  *(indicate Fall, Winter, Spring or Summer and Year)* ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title/ Number</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/ Electives</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title/ Number</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Required/ Electives</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TERM  *(indicate Fall, Winter, Spring or Summer and Year)*______________

TERM  *(indicate Fall, Winter, Spring or Summer and Year)*______________

TERM  *(indicate Fall, Winter, Spring or Summer and Year)*______________
Appendix C

Early Intervention Core Courses
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 important 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 head 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: SPED 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.
Appendix D

Early Intervention Program Evaluation Forms

1. Professional Activities Rating Form
2. Leadership Qualities Rating Form
3. Competency Areas Rating Form
4. Quarterly Professional Activities, Competency Areas, and Leadership Qualities Planning and Evaluation Form
5. Follow-up Program Evaluation Survey
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES RATING FORM
University of Oregon EI/ECSE Leadership Training Program

Name: ________________________________________________  Date Initiated: _____________________________
Advisor: __________________________________________________

These 15 professional activities are thought to be necessary to become knowledgeable and skillful in EI/ECSE. Both student and advisor should independently rate the student across the 15 activities at the conclusion of each term as a way to monitor student progress.

4 = great need  3 = substantial need  2 = some need  1 = competent, no need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
<th>Specific Activity</th>
<th>Approved by</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Co-Teach EI/ECSE Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Offer Inservice Trainings (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervise Licensure Students (3 terms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate Work Samples (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conduct Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Write Grant Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Review/Critique Journal Manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Write Journal Article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conduct Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Complete Course Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conduct Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Participate in Ongoing Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conduct Pilot Research Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Participate on Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Write Policy Paper (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Vita/Goal Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEADERSHIP QUALITIES RATING FORM
University of Oregon EI/ECSE Leadership Training Program

Name: ___________________________________________________    Date Initiated: _________________
Advisor: __________________________________________________

These 9 leadership qualities are thought to be necessary to become a successful leader in the area of EI/ECSE. Both student and advisor should independently rate the student across the 9 qualities at the conclusion of each term as a way to monitor student progress.

4 = great need  3 = substantial need  2 = some need  1 = competent, no need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Quality</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluates Self Accurately</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicates Effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incorporates Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shows Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accepts Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Makes Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Manages Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Solves Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Offers Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EIP Leadership Program 2007-2008
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COMPETENCY AREAS RATING FORM
University of Oregon EI/ECSE Leadership Training Program

Name: ____________________________ Date Initiated: ____________________________
Advisor: ___________________________

These 11 competencies are thought to be necessary to become knowledgeable and skillful in EI/ECSE. Both student and advisor should *independently* rate the student across the 11 competency areas at the conclusion of each term as a way to monitor student progress.

4 = great need  3 = substantial need  2 = some need  1 = competent, no need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Special Education Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EI/ECSE Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessment/Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clinical Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Research/Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Writing/Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Policy Development/Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUARTERLY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, COMPETENCY AREAS, AND LEADERSHIP QUALITIES PLANNING AND EVALUATION FORM
University of Oregon EI/ECSE Leadership Training Program

Name:_________________________ Term:_______ Year:_______ Advisor:____________________

Competency:____________________________ Leadership Quality Area:______________________

Proposed Activities or Strategies for Acquiring Competency or Leadership Quality:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Proposed Evaluation Strategy:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Evaluation Outcome:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

Rating:

needs direction   needs guidance   acceptable   above average   superior
  1               2               3              4                    5

Recommendations:
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY
University of Oregon Interdisciplinary EI/ECSE Leadership Training Program

Name:__________________________________________ Date:______________________________

DOB:__________________________________________ Age:_______________________________

Permanent Address:______________________________________________________________

Phone:___________________________

Current Address:_________________________________________________________________

Phone:___________________________

1. Year graduated:________

2. Have you taken any additional professional training since graduation?

   _____ Yes           _____ No

   If yes, describe training:____________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________________________

3. Where are you currently working? (Attach a job description if available.)

   Title/Position  Location

   __________________________________________________________________________

4. Indicate the percent of time you spend fulfilling the following roles.

   ____percent of time spent as a program developer

   ____percent of time spent as an instructor or trainer

   ____percent of time spent as a researcher or program evaluator

   ____percent of time spent as a policy developer

5. Have you made a presentation at a professional meeting in the last year?

   _____ Yes           _____ No

   If yes, describe where and what topic?________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________________________
6. In the last year, have you submitted a professional paper for publication or had a professional paper accepted for publication?

_____ Yes  _____ No

If yes, describe where and what topic?


Please rate questions 7 -10 using the following key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = moderately agree
3 = moderately disagree
4 = strongly disagree
NA = not applicable

7. The program prepared me for the following professional roles:

program developer  Rating  Comment
instructor  Rating  Comment
researcher/evaluator  Rating  Comment
policy developer  Rating  Comment

8. The core course work provided useful information.  Rating  Comment

9. The faculty/staff provided adequate supervision.  Rating  Comment

10. Program strengths:
Appendix E

Early Intervention/Special Education Program Plan documents

1. EI/SPED Plan Schedule
2. EI/SPED Competency Portfolio Plan & Completion Record
3. Personal Vita
4. Goal Statement
## Early Intervention/Special Education Program Plan Schedule

(fill in blanks when each course will be taken; fill in grade when completed)

### YEARS ONE & TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Coursework</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPED 607: Doctoral Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 626: Grant Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Coursework</strong> (beginning doc level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 627: Intro to Design and Quan Method</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 665: Qualitative Research in Education I</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 667: Single-subject Research Methods I</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 607: Program Evaluation I</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 607: Research issues in EI</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 607: Advanced Research Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 618: Statistics in Education I</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Coursework</strong> (advanced doc level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 668: Single Subject Research Methods II</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED 609: Program Evaluation II</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 619: Statistics in Education II</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 656: Experimental Research Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSY 620: Research Design in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Early Intervention/Special Education Program Plan Schedule

(fill in blanks that activities will be completed)

### YEARS THREE & FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Activity</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish program committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• List of course work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete vita and professional goal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First program committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review comp requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp exam:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concept Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Portfolio review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completed activities/products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposed activities/products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem statement, research question, hypothesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expected results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeline for completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committee formed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation proposal approval meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Early Intervention/Special Education Competency Portfolio Plan and Completion Record

**COMPETENCY AREAS RATING FORM**

University of Oregon EI/ECSE Leadership Training Program

Name: _______________________________________________

Advisor: ______________________________________________   Date Initiated: _____________________________

These 11 competencies are thought to be necessary to become knowledgeable and skillful in EI/ECSE. Both student and advisor should *independently* rate the student across the 11 competency areas at the conclusion of each term as a way to monitor student progress.

4 = great need  3 = substantial need  2 = some need  1 = competent, no need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Special Education Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EI/ECSE Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Team Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessment/Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clinical Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Program Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Research/Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Writing/Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Policy Development/Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA

Early Intervention/Special Education Area Phone: (541) 000-0000
College of Education Email: @uoregon.edu
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Education:

Experience:

Publications:

Presentations:

Community Activities:

Scholarships:

(add pages as needed)
PROFESSIONAL GOAL STATEMENT

[Your name]
University of Oregon
College of Education
Early Intervention/Special Education Area
5253 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
(541) 346-0807
Your_email@uoregon.edu

(add pages as needed)

Appendix F
Student Policies

1. SPED Remediation, Retention, and Dismissal policy
2. SPECS Department Policy on GTF Promotions
3. SPECS Student Funding Guidelines
STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES ADAPTED FOR SPED, ACCEPTED BY SPED DOCTORAL COMMITTEE, 1/11/05

The following procedures are to be taken to (a) address and resolve concerns and problems presented by doctoral students during the course of his or her doctoral program or (b) terminate the student from the program.

Quarterly review by the Advisor

A quarterly review process should be conducted within the context of student-advisor meetings that should be held quarterly. The content and materials used in these evaluations are described under Student Advising.

During the quarterly review any problems the student has, or is, encountering in completing his or her program should be noted and- if possible- addressed and resolved. If the advisor is sufficiently concerned about the significance of the problem or the students’ potential to progress toward successful resolution, the issue should be referred to the student’s program committee.

Review by the Program Committee

If the student has established a program committee, concerns regarding the student’s lack of progress toward completion of the doctoral program should first be referred to the program committee. If a program committee has not been established, one should be established for the purpose of addressing the concern at hand.

The committee members should review the particular issue(s) that is presented and prepare a Remediation Plan to assist the student to resolve the issue. The Remediation Plan should include objectives, related activities, outcomes, responsibilities for each objective, and timelines, as well as a specific date by which the program committee will reconvene to review and evaluate the student’s progress in relation to the remediation plan. Each Remediation Plan should be designed to reflect the concerns for an individual student. For example, faculty concerns about knowledge competencies may be addressed through an agreement to take additional coursework in specific areas. Professional competencies such as work completion habits, or assessment skills may be addressed by removing incomplete grades or completing additional assignments within one quarter.

There are two possible outcomes from the program committee’s review of the student’s progress in addressing the requirements of the Remediation Plan: satisfactory progress and unsatisfactory progress. A student who is judged to have made satisfactory progress in meeting the requirements of the Remediation Plan will be regarded as in good standing with the Area and in his or her doctoral program. For students judged to have made unsatisfactory progress, the program committee may choose to (a) develop another Remediation Plan or (b) refer the matter to the doctoral committee.

For any actions and decisions made by the program committee, the advisor is responsible for communicating that information to the student through a letter.
Review by the Doctoral Committee

When the program committee has judged that a student either (a) has not made sufficient progress in meeting the requirements of a Remediation Plan or (b) presents an issue of sufficient magnitude to be considered for termination from the program, that student and issue should be referred to the doctoral committee. The doctoral committee’s responsibility will be to carefully review all of the information on the case and make one of two decisions. The doctoral committees may decide to recommend (a) that another remediation plan be developed for the student or (b) to terminate the student from the program.

If termination is recommended a letter describing the committee’s rationale and documentation for making the decision will be prepared and signed by the Area Head. The student then would have the option of grieving this decision through the procedures described below.

Grievance Procedures (The following procedures are COE policy)

The College of Education has established a grievance procedure should students be dissatisfied with course or progress evaluations or their interactions with faculty members or other students. In addition, students may receive consultation and support of the Office of Student Advocacy which is located in the Erb Memorial Union. The College of Education grievance follows:

A student or group of students of the College of Education may appeal decisions or actions pertaining to admissions, programs, evaluation of performance, and program retention and completion. No student shall be penalized or discriminated against for utilizing this procedure. A grievance must be filed during the term in which the circumstances occurred, or before the end of the next term in which the student is registered as a student in a College of Education program.

Steps in the procedure are outlined below. They are designed for use by an individual student, or a group of students who join together to submit a collective or class grievance.

Step 1

The student(s) will attempt to resolve any disagreement or grievance with the faculty or staff member in question. If the grievance is not resolved to the student(s)’ satisfaction within three academic calendar weeks of initial contact with the faculty or staff member, the student(s) may proceed to Step 2 of this procedure.

Step 2

The Step 2 appeal will be to the next logical level of authority within the department in which the student(s) course or program resides, or in which the faculty or staff member being grieved against holds appointment. This would be the “director of graduate studies,” “department head,” or similar title, depending upon the administrative organization of the department. In the event of different interpretations of what constitutes the next appropriate level of administrative review, the Dean of the College of Education will rule on the definition of Step 2 administrators for the particular grievance. Administrators who are party to the grievance will not be part of the review process; in the event of
such an occurrence, the grievance will move to the next logical level of review as determined by the Dean of the College of Education.

The student(s) will submit a written statement describing the basis for the grievance, how they have been wronged, and the attempts made to date to resolve the grievance with the faculty or staff member. The written statement should be submitted along with available supporting evidence (e.g., a course syllabus, test, term paper) to the designated Step 2 administrator.

The faculty or staff member grieved against will be notified of the grievance within two weeks of the regular academic calendar of its submission to the Step 2 administrator, and will be given a copy of the grievance statement of facts and any supporting evidence. Within three academic calendar weeks of being so informed, the faculty or staff member will submit a written statement of facts and any supporting evidence concerning the student(s) grievance to the Step 2 administrator. A copy of this written statement and any supporting evidence will be given to the student(s) within one week of its receipt. Within three academic calendar weeks of receiving statements and evidence from both parties, the Step 2 administrator shall inform both parties, the Step 2 administrator may seek additional evidence or consultation during this review period. Step 2 should be completed in four academic calendar weeks, beginning with the day that the student(s) submitted a grievance statement to the Step 2 administrator. With concurrence of both parties of the grievance the time period could be extended.

**Step 3**

If the Step 2 administrator sustains the faculty or staff member’s position and the student(s) decide to appeal, the student(s) may request that the grievance decision be reviewed at the next higher level of administrative review in the College of Education. This would most often be the Associate Dean for Academic Programs, but will be defined in terms of the earlier definition of the appropriate Step 2 administrator. The Dean of the College of Education will rule on the appropriate reviewer in cases of disagreement.

If the Step 2 administrator sustains the student(s)’ position and the faculty or staff member decides to appeal, the faculty or staff person may also request that the grievance decision be reviewed at the next higher level of administrative review in the College of Education. In either event, the appeal must be made within two academic calendar weeks of the Step 2 decision.

Upon receipt of an appeal from either party, the Step 3 administrator shall inform the other party of the appeal. The Step 3 administrator shall subsequently inform both parties in writing of his/her decision within two academic calendar weeks of receipt of the appeal. The Step 3 administrator may seek additional evidence and/or consultation as deemed appropriate.

Step 3 should be completed within two academic calendar weeks, beginning with the day either the student(s) or faculty/staff member requests a review from the Step 3 administrator.

**Step 4**

If the student(s) are dissatisfied with the Step 3 decision, they may ask for review by the Dean of the College of Education, if the Dean has not already been included in Step 2 or Step 3 review, and is not a party to the grievance. The Dean may choose to convene a panel to review the grievance, or may seek
additional evidence or consultation as the Dean deems appropriate. The Dean may also choose to refer the grievance appeal to an appropriate University grievance committee.

Step 5

If the student(s) are dissatisfied with the Step 4 decision, they may take the grievance to an appropriate University committee (listed below).

**Alternative ways to file a grievance**

**Grades.** If the grievance pertains to a disputed grade, the student(s) may talk with a member of the Office of Academic Advising and Student Services (164 Oregon Hall, 346-3211) about appropriate petitioning procedures.

**Faculty/Staff.** If the grievance pertains to some other aspect of faculty or staff responsibilities, the student may contact a member of the Student-Faculty Committee on Grievances. Five faculty members and five students are on the committee. Faculty committee members are listed in the back of the University of Oregon Faculty-Staff telephone directory. Procedures used by the Student-Faculty Grievance Committee to settle grievances include informal consultation and formal investigation. If the Committee is unable to resolve the complaint or grievance in a manner that is acceptable to the persons concerned, the Committee will prepare a report of its findings and recommendations to be forwarded to the President of the University.

**Discrimination.** If any student enrolled in the College of Education or in a College of Education course believes s/he has been discriminated against on the basis of age, sex, race, marital status, religion, handicap, or national origin, s/he may contact the appropriate college affirmative action liaison officer, the Dean of the College of Education, or may take the grievance directly to the University Office of Affirmative Action. If students are unsure as to which grievance procedures to use, they may talk with any staff member in the Office of Academic Services and Student Support.
SPECS DEPARTMENT POLICY ON GTF PROMOTIONS

2008 - 2009

It is the responsibility of each GTF to make sure he/she is initially hired at the appropriate GTF level and then advanced to the next level when appropriate. Promotion to the next GTF level, with a corresponding annual rate increase, occurs the term following the completion of that level’s requirements.

It is the policy of the UO Graduate School and the SPECS Department not to grant retroactive promotions to the next level if the request is made more than 2 terms after completing the requirements for advancement. **It is the responsibility of each GTF to notify their program’s business manager or academic secretary in a timely manner that they have completed the necessary criteria for advancement to the next level.**

Levels of Appointment

GTF I: Regularly enrolled graduate students admitted to a graduate degree program or doctoral students who are not eligible for a GTF II or GTF III appointment.

GTF II: Regularly enrolled graduate students who have a) a master’s degree in the same or cognate field, or b) successfully completed a qualifying examination, or c) completed 45 credit hours toward a doctoral degree and have verification of same from the program’s academic secretary.

GTF III: Regularly enrolled doctoral students who have been advanced to candidacy.
DEPARTMENT of
SPECIAL EDUCATION and CLINICAL SCIENCES
STUDENT FUNDING GUIDELINES

The Department of Special Education and Clinical Sciences (SPECS) within the College of Education offers a number of opportunities for students seeking funding support. This handout identifies and explains the different ways student funding support is offered, and the process that a student should follow to procure funding.

GRADUATE TEACHING FELLOWSHIP (GTF)

The Department of Special Education and Clinical Sciences offers funding for our graduate students in the form of graduate teaching fellowships (GTFs) up to .49 FTE (full-time equivalent). These awards are based on merit and not financial need. Each carries a tuition waiver (except incidental fees of approximately $206). In addition to the non-instructional fees outlined above, new graduate students will be charged a one-time $250 matriculation fee during their first term of enrollment. There is a monthly salary based on the appointment FTE and education qualifications (degree held) of the student. Appointments are made for a minimum of .20 FTE and a maximum of .49 FTE, and may be for the full academic year or on a term-by-term basis. Workloads for GTFs shall be prorated on the percentage basis of FTE. For example, a .20 FTE shall be assigned employment responsibilities that do not exceed a maximum of 88 hours of work per quarter, and proportionately for appointments at other FTEs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Hours Per Quarter</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New students can apply for these awards of financial assistance by completing the GTF award application found at http://education.uoregon.edu/; a listing of available GTF positions can be found at this same website. Health insurance is provided during the academic year (for more information on health insurance, contact the Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation at gtfben@efn.org or 541-344-0832).

Reappointments are not automatic, nor are they guaranteed. In order to be reappointed, GTFs must make satisfactory progress toward their graduate degree and receive a satisfactory job performance evaluation.

GTFs are eligible to receive a summer sandwich tuition waiver (which carries the same salary and tuition waiver as an academic year appointment) if: a) they held a GTF appointment for at least 2 terms during the academic year and will be appointed for the following fall, or b) they held a spring term appointment during the current academic year and will be appointed for all three terms the following academic year.
TRAINING/RESEARCH GRANT SUPPORT

Training or research funding support may be available for students with Ph.D. or Master’s level academic standing. These appointments are funded through training and research grants awarded to the university by federal agencies and private sources for support of the basic training and research programs in the Department of Special Education and Clinical Sciences. Selection for these positions is based on a student’s interest in a particular training or research area, and occurs by mutual agreement of the student and the faculty member directing the work. Students seeking training or research grant-funded support should contact the faculty member directing a funded project. Research conducted under these appointments is used to satisfy advanced degree requirements.

Funding may include: a) quarterly tuition waiver, b) monthly (9 or 12-month) stipend payment, and c) health insurance coverage. Students must maintain satisfactory progress in their course of study to continue receiving federally-funded financial support.

Students who receive financial assistance (tuition/stipend) from a personnel preparation grant awarded by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) have additional obligations. Students must agree to a service obligation by working in the field of special education, related services or early intervention after program completion for a specified period of time as repayment. If the student fails to meet their obligation through work, they must reimburse the federal government for the amount of support they received (or whatever share they have not paid back through work) plus interest and collection fees that the federal government may levy. Students sign a legal and binding Service Obligation Agreement before receiving financial assistance and an Exit Agreement before leaving the UO.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION STUDENT SCHOLARSHIPS AND RESEARCH AWARDS

The College of Education awards scholarships and research awards ranging from $500 - $5,000 to COE students to support their studies. In some cases these scholarships may provide awards to multiple recipients. The scholarship application, checklist, and research award list are available in the Office of the Dean and online http://education.uoregon.edu/ in the fall of each year for the next academic year. Applications are generally due in February; selections are made by early April.

STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Student employees are students first and foremost and, in recognition of this, are limited to a total of half-time employment at the UO each month. This limit includes all student employment positions held simultaneously. During term breaks and one term each year, students on leave from school may be employed full-time. Summer term is considered a term. Students may have a GTF appointment and also work as a student employee. These students are limited to .49 FTE employment counting both GTF and student employment hours, and may lose their GTF appointment if they exceed this limit. There are five levels of student employment recognizing various skill levels required to perform student jobs. Each program advertises for and hires its own student employees, http://hr.uoregon.edu/recruit.
COLLEGE WORK STUDY PROGRAM, LOANS AND GRANTS

The College Work Study Program (under federal funding for students from low-income families) provides an alternative means of financial assistance. For work study certification and to apply for loans or grants, a separate request for forms should be made to the Office of Student Financial Aid, 1278 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1278, http://financialaid.uoregon.edu/.

FUNDING for SUMMER TERM

There is no guarantee of summer support. Students who require summer support need to contact academic Program Directors and/or research Principal Investigators during fall term to make arrangements for the following summer. GTFs who qualify for the summer sandwich tuition waiver must complete the Request for Summer Sandwich Tuition Waiver form by the last day of the fall term following the summer enrollment. This form can be found on the Graduate School web page or you can contact the Business Manager of your program for assistance, http://gradschool.uoregon.edu/pdf/sandwichGTF.pdf

STUDENT STIPENDS

A stipend recipient is usually not restricted by the funding agency or the university from supplementing a stipend award through employment; however, the College of Education policy is that employment associated with the university should not exceed a .49 FTE level.

Two types of university student employment exist. The first is university hourly student employment. Assigned tasks can range from clerical support to computer programming. Wage rates and hours claimed must conform to established audit standards. The second kind of employment is defined by graduate teaching fellowship standards. GTF tasks are to be closely related professional-level academic duties such as teaching or conducting research. The maximum stipend-GTF combination for 2008-2009 cannot exceed $3,000 per month for doctoral students or $2,000 per month for master's students.
## Minimum GTF Salaries
### 2008 - 2009

(Effective Date: September 16, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GTF I</th>
<th>GTF II</th>
<th>GTF III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Rate (@1.0 FTE)</td>
<td>2,470.33</td>
<td>2,790.00</td>
<td>2,946.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rate (@ 1.0 FTE)</td>
<td>22,233.00</td>
<td>25,110.00</td>
<td>26,520.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual FTE:</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>494.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>741.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>988.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1,210.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTENTION: Graduate Students Receiving Financial Aid

Federal regulations require students to notify the Financial Aid Office (1-800-760-6953 or 541-346-3221) as soon they know that they will receive any educational resources so that necessary revisions to their financial aid package can be made. Such resources include a GTF position, fellowship, scholarship, or any other type of monetary award. Because receiving additional financial resources may reduce your financial aid award, you should contact the Financial Aid Office prior to applying for a GTF position or other type of support.