Welcome!

The faculty and staff in the Early Intervention Program and the Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE) Leadership Program welcome you as a doctoral student. We are pleased that you have selected the University of Oregon to pursue your doctoral degree and look forward to working with you throughout your academic career.

The major goal of the Early Intervention Program is to expand and improve educational and therapeutic services for infants and young children who are at risk and disabled and their families. Underlying this goal or purpose is the assumption that improving and expanding services will effect positive change in children and their families which, in turn, will result in their positive contributions to the community and society. Assisting individual children and their families to become independent and productive yields a benefit to the individual as well as to the greater society. Leadership skills will assist you in conducting teaching research, policy development, and other scholarly activities in EI/ECSE.

This handbook provides you with key information on the procedures for completing your doctoral program of study. This information, along with information provided by the Special Education major and the College of Education, will assist you in preparing for various aspects of your degree and in submitting required documents within established guidelines and in a timely manner.

The Early Intervention Program website, [http://eip.uoregon.edu/index.html](http://eip.uoregon.edu/index.html), is updated on a regular basis. Information regarding University of Oregon policies, procedures, deadlines, and forms required by the College of Education can be found on the University of Oregon College of Education website at: [http://education.uoregon.edu/path.htm?setpath=19](http://education.uoregon.edu/path.htm?setpath=19). We strongly encourage you to regularly check these resources for updated information.

Welcome!
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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 delineates the various components of the program and guides doctoral students in planning their studies. The Handbook is divided into the following sections:

I.  *Section one* provides a description of the program rationale that underlies services for at-risk and disabled children ages birth to six and their families. This section also includes a description of the philosophical perspectives underlying EI/ECSE leadership training.

II.  *Section two* provides a 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 and organizational structure. These various programs are interrelated and contribute to the EI/ECSE doctoral program.

III.  *Section three* provides a general overview of the program, goals, and training model. The aim of this program is to prepare doctoral students to provide leadership in the area of EI/ECSE. Students who graduate from this program are qualified to serve in the following roles: academic faculty, program developers, policy developers/analysts, applied researchers, and instructors.

IV.  *Section four* provides a description of the program procedures and components, student evaluations, and policies. This section of the handbook contains an overview of program procedures and describes the apprenticeship model. Also, this section contains descriptions of the seven program components which include course work, field work, leadership qualities, competency areas, professional activities, comprehensive
examination, and dissertation. Evaluation procedures and student policies are also described.

V. *Section five* provides information pertinent to international doctoral students.

VI. *Section six* describes the College of Education and Early Intervention Program student policies. This section contains a set of policies that are particularly relevant to students in the EI/ECSE doctoral program.

The handbook covers essential information for the EI/ECSE doctoral program. All doctoral students are encouraged to read and become familiar with its contents. Students should use the handbook as a resource to plan their graduate programs.

I. **Rationale for Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education and Philosophical Perspective Underlying EI/ECSE Leadership Training**

Theoretical Framework

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; and (2) Early experience is critical in shaping children’s development (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000; Thompson, 2009; Moffit, Arsenealt, Belsky et al., 2011). 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. If programs are conceptually sound and services
are delivered by qualified personnel, 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 (Love et al., 2005; Ramey & Ramey, 2004; Reynolds, Ou, & Topitzes, 2004; Odom, 2009; Shore, 2003).

Also shown in Figure 1, three theoretical assumptions 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 genetic, biological or environmental deficits; (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.

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,
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, 2010). 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.

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 (Bertelli, Silverman, & Talbot, 2009; Dunst, Trivette, & Hamby, 2006). 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 (Mahoney & Wiggers, 2007). 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. 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 (Feil et al., 2009; Mashburn et al., 2008). 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 (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). 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 and Transdisciplinary Perspectives
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 (Derrington & Lippitt, 2008; Perlman & Fantuzzo, 2010; Robinson & Rosenberg, 2004; Stahmer, Sutton, Fox, & Leslie, 2008; Wulczyn, Barth, Yuan, Harden, & Landsverk, 2006).

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, Education Studies, Special Education and Clinical Sciences, and Educational Methodology, Policy, and Leadership. The Early Intervention Program is located in the Special Education and Clinical Sciences department. The research institutes in the College of Education 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 and the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (http://ucedd.uoregon.edu). The Center on Human Development and UCEDD house 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. 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 at risk and disabled. Dr. Squires teaches doctoral level graduate courses in EI/ECSE and advises students. She is director of the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD), serves on the Research and Outreach Council, and directs several federal grants related to screening, social-emotional development, personnel training, and assessment. She has also worked with state level planners throughout the nation to develop child find and monitoring systems, and is involved in several projects involving Head Start, Early Head Start, and child welfare, Part C, and in international projects in several countries including Chile, China, Brazil, Canada, Germany, and Thailand.

**Jantina Clifford, Ph.D.** 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.

**Wendy Machalicek, Ph.D.** (University of Texas at Austin, 2008). Dr. Machalicek has served as Special Education Faculty Coordinator at the Wisconsin Maternal and Child Health Leadership Education in Neurodevelopmental and Related Disabilities Program at the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities at the University of Wisconsin-Madison; as faculty at the Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison; and as an investigator at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities Research Center in Madison, WI. She will be teaching the graduate level course *Family-Guided Early Intervention* in the Early Intervention Master’s Program.

**Liz Twombly, M.Ed.** Ms. Twombly works as a Senior Research Assistant and Instructor at the University of Oregon's Early Intervention Program. Liz currently coordinates project BEST (Benchmarks in Early Screening and Testing), a research project funded through the Center on Disease Control (CDC) focused on creating benchmark (i.e., indicators) for early intervention systems that may increase the timeliness and efficiency of state's Part C services. Liz also co-coordinates the Family Early Advocacy and Treatment (FEAT) Project, focused on creating policies and procedures to ensure the identification, referral and safe care of substance exposed newborns in communities in Oregon. Liz has worked on the Ages and Stages Questionnaires (ASQ) research team for the past 20 years, is a contributing author on the third edition of the ASQ, one of the authors on the Ages and Stages Questionnaires: Social Emotional (ASQ:SE), and lead author on the ASQ Learning Activities. Liz provides training across the U.S. and other
countries on the use of these screening tools as well as broader screening and child find systems. Liz areas of interest include infant mental health, the inclusion of mental health in early intervention systems, family-guided early intervention, and the adaptation of assessment measures to ensure culturally appropriateness.

Linda Albi, M.S. Ms. Albi is currently the Early Intervention Program's practicum coordinator and instructor of several graduate courses. Ms. Albi has a Master's degree in Early Intervention/Special Education and experience as an interventionist in community-based sites. She is also the supervisor of master's level students, co-coordinator of the rural master's program, Director of BOOST (Building on Opportunities for Summer Teaching) the EIP summer preschool classroom. She serves on the TSPC licensure committee and parent advisory board.

Misti Waddell, M.S. (University of Oregon, 1993). Ms. Waddell, is a Senior Research Assistant in the Early Intervention Program at the University of Oregon. Since the early 1980s she has coordinated numerous federally funded, field-initiated research projects, systems change and outreach training projects. Ms.Waddell contributes to the ongoing research and development of the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS) and provides AEPS training nationwide. In addition, she provides training on the Ages and Stages Questionnaires-3 and the Ages and Stages Questionnaires:Social Emotional. She also works as a supervisor for the Early Intervention Master’s Program.

Kris Funk, MA, L.C.S.W. Ms. Funk holds a Master’s Degree in Social Work from the University of Chicago and is licensed in the state of Oregon as a clinical social worker. She has worked in the early childhood field since 2000, providing outreach and training to early childhood and elementary school-based professionals nationwide. Kristin has worked on several outreach grant projects in the Early Intervention Program including Project FEAT (Family Early Advocacy and Treatment.), a 5-year federally funded systems-change grant focused on the identification, referral and safe care of substance-exposed newborns in Lane County and Oregon, which she co-coordinated. She is currently involved in research with the SEAM (Social Emotional Assessment Measure) a curriculum-based social emotional assessment for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers.
She also provides training to early childhood and other professionals in the use of the Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System (AEPS), the Ages and Stages Questionnaires (ASQ) and the I Can Problem Solve® (ICPS) Curriculum.

Karen Lawrence, Ph.D. Dr. Lawrence is an assistant teacher with children with disabilities and a project coordinator for the EARLY autism institute at the University of Oregon. Her research interests include early childhood mental health services, family early advocacy and treatment services and safe care of substance exposed newborns, and infant mental health mentor model in early intervention. She will serve as assistant instructor of graduate level courses in the Early Intervention Master’s Program.

Debra Eisert, Ph.D. (University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1980). Dr. Eisert is an Associate Professor and Research Associate in the Department of Pediatrics at the Child Development and Rehabilitation Center, a division of Oregon Health Sciences University, and co-director of the University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities in Eugene, OR. She has been a licensed psychologist in the state of Oregon since 1983. She teaches the Autism in Early Intervention course in the Early Intervention Master’s Program.

Main 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 Methodology, Policy, and Leadership**
The area of Educational Methodology, Policy, and Leadership has much to offer EI/ECSE students. Courses and field experience address educational foundations,
advanced statistical methodology, operations, 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 aim of this interdisciplinary EI/ECSE doctoral training program is to academically and practically prepare professionals to provide leadership in the area of EI/ECSE. This program offers a non-categorical, competency-based interdisciplinary course of study designed to train academic faculty for institutions of higher education, applied researchers, policy analysts, and program developers capable of leading and advancing the field of EI/ECSE.

Doctoral students acquire the competencies and leadership expertise through participation in selected course work and professional activities. Course work includes core courses focused on early intervention / early childhood special education, foundations in special education, statistics, research design / methodology, electives, and dissertation credits.

The field experiences for each doctoral candidate 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 doctoral student becomes competent in executing these four roles. However, depending upon a student's background or interest, one role may be emphasized over the others. This program is individualized to each doctoral candidate in terms of the academic pursuits. For example, rather than structuring a rigid sequence of course work and field experience, each student develops an individual plan for his/her program of studies. Figure 2 shows leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities in relationship 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 roles of program developers, instructors, applied researchers, and policy analysts.

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. The College of Education sets specific minimum requirements for statistics and research courses.

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.

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 gaining thorough knowledge of the fields and areas of related importance as well as critical analytic skills and familiarity with the 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. 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.

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
Figure 2. Relationship of program leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities to training opportunities and leadership roles.
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 future success as a professional.

The apprenticeship model provides a broad and general framework for students to acquire the program's targeted leadership qualities, competency areas, and professional activities, which are 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.

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 135 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 take at least 6 research courses: 4 in one tradition and 2 in a second, or 5 in one tradition and 1 in a second with approval. The traditions are: single-subject research, qualitative research, and quantitative research. Students may also complete two courses in Program Evaluation as their second methodological tradition. See SPED doctoral handbook for a listing of the courses within each tradition. The research core courses are shown in Table 1. Table 2 contains a suggested EI/ECSE schedule for statistics and graduate requirements. Table 3 contains the EIP Activities Schedule.
### 2011 – 2012 Academic Year

#### Required Courses & Pre-Requisites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>EDUC 612 Social Science Research Design</td>
<td>EDST 670 Philosophy of Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC 614 Educational Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quantitative Research Strand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>* EDUC 640 Applied Statistical Design and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>EDUC 642 Multiple Regression in Educational Research</td>
<td>EDUC 644 Applied Multivariate Statistics</td>
<td>EDUC 646 Advanced Research Design (even years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLD 628 HLM I (even years)</td>
<td>EDLD 629 HLM II (even years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDLD 633 SEM I (odd years)</td>
<td>EDLD 634 SEM II (odd years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Single-Subject Research Strand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>* EDUC 650 Single-Subject Research Methods I</td>
<td>EDUC 652 Single-Subject Research Methods II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>EDUC 654 Adv Applied Behavior Analysis</td>
<td>SPED 610 Adv Analysis of Single Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Qualitative Research Strand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Year 1

* EDUC 630 Qualitative Methodology I: Interpretive Inquiry

EDUC 632 Qualitative Data Analysis & Collection I

### Year 2

EDUC 634 Qualitative Methodology II: Reflexive Inquiry

EDUC 636 Qualitative Data Analysis & Collection II

### Program Evaluation Strand (Secondary Focus Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* EDUC 620 Program Eval I (odd years)</td>
<td>EDUC 621 Program Eval II (odd years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sequence begins with this course.

**NOTE:** PRE-REQUISITES VARY BY COURSE. SEE UO CATALOG AND/OR ON-LINE CLASS SCHEDULE FOR DETAILS.

The primary emphasis in qualitative methodology is designed for students who wish to use qualitative research methods in their doctoral dissertation work. Students complete four courses. Two courses focus on the design and epistemological foundations of qualitative research methods (i.e., Qualitative Methodology 1 and Qualitative Methodology 2). Students complete a third course on the analysis and collection of qualitative data (i.e., Qualitative Data Analysis & Collection 1). For the fourth course in the primary emphasis, students may complete either a third course in research design (i.e., Qualitative Methodology 3) or a second course in qualitative data collection and analysis (i.e., Qualitative Data Analysis & Collection 2).

The secondary emphasis on qualitative methodology is designed for students who wish to read and incorporate the findings of qualitative research into their doctoral research but do not plan to use them as their primary methodological approach. Students complete two courses. The first course focuses on the design and epistemological foundations of qualitative research methods (Qualitative Methodology 1). The second course examines qualitative data collection and analysis (Qualitative Data Analysis & Collection 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s &amp; beginning doctoral *</th>
<th>Tests &amp; Measurements in Education (SPSY 617) 4 credits</th>
<th>Foundations of Disability II (SPED 411/511) 3 credits</th>
<th>Research Issues in EI (SPED 607) 1-3 credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>Multiple Regression in Educational Research (EDUC 642) 4 credits</td>
<td>History of Special Ed &amp; Disabilities (SPED 622) 3 credits Qualitative Methodology I (EDUC 630) 4 credits</td>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>Single-subject Research Methods I (EDUC 650) 3 credits Educational Statistics (EDUC 614) 4 credits Philosophy of Research (EDST 670) 4 credits</td>
<td>Applied Multivariate Statistics (EDUC 644) 4 credits</td>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>Single-subject Research Methods II (EDUC 652) 3 credits</td>
<td>Advanced Research Design (EDUC 646) 1-5 credits Applied Statistical Design and Analysis (EDUC 640)</td>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced doctoral</strong></td>
<td>Grant Writing (SPED 626) 3 credits * prerequisite SPED 607</td>
<td>Superv Coll Teach (SPED 602)</td>
<td>Dissertation (SPED 603)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>Program Eval I 3 credits (odd years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>Program Eval II 3 credits (odd years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>Program Eval II 3 credits (odd years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Doctoral Advanced Topical Seminars Examples:**
- Item Response Theory (EDLD 661)
- Seminar Advanced Applied Behavior Analysis (EDUC 654)

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

**Statistics series can be taken through Psychology
Table 3. Suggested Early Intervention Doctoral Program Activities Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR ONE</th>
<th>YEAR TWO</th>
<th>YEAR THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Research Requirements</td>
<td>• Minimum of 6 research courses in 2 different traditions: single-subject research, qualitative research, and quantitative research.</td>
<td>Dissertation (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of SPED SPED 622</td>
<td>Philosop hy of Res EDST 670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core EI courses</td>
<td>Core EI courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Activity (suggested)</td>
<td>Establish program committee &amp; develop program plan</td>
<td>Begin comprehensive exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Complete program competencies</td>
<td>Advance to Candidacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 might be 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 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 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 the 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 includes knowledge of typical 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 core 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 Master’s 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 used in the concept paper.

• **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 for Professional Activities Rating Form.

To 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. 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.

What is the purpose of the Concept Paper? 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: (a) examining a “new” concept, idea, practice, or theory in the field; (b) conducting a new or unique review, synthesis, or analysis of the literature; or by (c) proposing or addressing a new application, demonstration, or other use of the professional literature and knowledge base.

How is the Concept Paper evaluated? The concept paper should satisfy the following criteria:
1. Gains approval of 2-3 faculty members on the student’s program committee.
2. Focuses on a topic other than the dissertation to reveal breadth of content or methodological expertise.
3. Is between 20-40 pages in length.
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

- **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 the concept paper, 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 in-service trainings, 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 in core coursework and concept paper).
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, including the concept paper.

1. **Competence in Core Coursework**
   - Satisfactory* completion of core EI/ECSE classes, research seminar (3 terms), and research series. Students should complete at least 1 course in each of 2 research traditions before they can advance. This is towards the COE requirement of 6 total (4 and 2).
   - * Satisfactory is defined by a grade of B or better or a grade of Pass (P) in all courses.

2. **Competence in Scholarly Writing**

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.

**instead of section below, insert this:** Once this form is signed and dated, the Academic Secretary will then begin the Advancement process in GradWeb. The student and advisor will both receive email prompts when it is necessary for them to log into GradWeb and provide information during this process. The student, advisor, and the Academic Secretary will all receive an email when the Graduate School has officially approved the student’s advancement to candidacy. The student must be registered for UO credits during the term in which advancement to candidacy occurs.
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) The chair and at least one inside member must from SPED major.
      b) One member from outside the student’s department.
   3) Revise draft and resubmit
   4) Submit Human Subjects Compliance Protocol (Requires approximately 2-4 weeks).
      a) 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 Graduate School website 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) Student should apply to graduate by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Friday of the term.
      b) Complete Request to Schedule Oral Defense form
      c) Submit 2 signed copies of abstract to Graduate School.
4) Oral defense

Dissertations will be submitted electronically and 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/sites/default/files/ETD_Style_Manual_2011_July_19.pdf

NOTE: No less than 6 months may pass between establishing the dissertation committee and the Oral Defense.
STUDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Special Education Program continuously evaluates student progress and skill development. This is accomplished at various levels in terms of frequency and specificity.

Students must maintain “good standing” for the duration of their program. Minimal requirements for “good standing” include:

- Maintaining a GPA of 3.0 in graduate courses taken in the degree program.
- Earning P’s in all practica and field experiences. (A grade of P must be equal to or better than a B-).
- Making satisfactory progress toward the degree.
- No more than 5 credits of incomplete (excluding dissertation and thesis).
- Maintaining continuous enrollment unless awarded on-leave or in absentia status. (See OTHER DEGREE REQUIREMENTS, Continuous Enrollment).
- Maintaining a professionalism that is expected of a doctoral candidate at the University of Oregon.

Quarterly Review

Students should meet at least quarterly with their advisors to plan their coursework, review their program plan and Competency Portfolio, work on professional growth assessment, and discuss long-term goals. The content of these meetings is meant to be consultative regarding future planning and evaluative in terms of student experiences and competencies to date. These quarterly meetings are to be formative in nature; that is, evaluation is designed to improve the student’s skills, not be a complete summative evaluation.

Annual Student Review and Evaluation

Each Spring Term, the Special Education Doctoral Committee undertakes a systematic review of each student. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide feedback on student progress, identify student strengths and weaknesses, and identify remedial activities or procedures that may be considered with students who are not performing up to program expectations. The review focuses on
general academic status and progress through coursework including practicum and internship, development of professional behaviors, and future plans. The composition of the review committee includes all members of the Special Education Doctoral Committee.

**Failure to Make Adequate Progress**

Students determined not to have made adequate progress toward completing their degrees or obtaining necessary professional competencies receive a summative evaluation of Unsatisfactory Progress. Students in this situation are not considered to be in good standing in the program. In such instances, the annual evaluation letter will address the specific concerns noted, and specific competencies, accomplishments, or other indicators of progress that are necessary to become a student in good standing. Students who receive an unsatisfactory evaluation should meet with their advisor soon after receiving their evaluation letter, for the purpose of discussing the concerns and developing a plan for addressing the concerns.

In most instances, the plan for addressing the concerns that led to the unsatisfactory evaluation is accomplished through the construction of a remediation agreement. This agreement is developed in writing by the student and the advisor in consultation with the Chair of the Doctoral Committee to specifically address the concerns of the faculty. Each remediation agreement is specifically designed to reflect the concerns for an individual student. 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. Each agreement lists the specific area of concern, the source of the information, the plan to remediate the problem, the evaluation plan and responsibilities and timelines. Failure to complete a remediation agreement may result in receiving a non-passing grade in a course or referral to 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 Committee 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 Department Head. The student then would have the option of filing a grievance with the UO over this decision (see Formal Academic Grievance Procedures, p. 45).

**Termination from a Program**

Students who choose to terminate their participation in a program voluntarily should notify their advisor and the Academic Secretary. The communication should indicate the term and year the student is leaving the program, the reason for termination and whether or not the student plans to return at a later date.

To be reinstated following voluntary relinquishment of standing, a student must reapply to the program. If the program admits the student, the student must be held to the program standards under which he or she was readmitted.

*Students may be asked to leave a program for a variety of reasons. Examples include but are not limited to lack of progress and unethical conduct. In addition, failure to follow Graduate School requirements for continuous enrollment will result in involuntary relinquishment of standing. In this case reapplication to the program is required for readmittance to be considered. Termination decisions will be supported with evidence. Once a decision is made to terminate a student, a letter must be sent to notify the student of the program’s decision. In this letter, the student should be given the reasons for termination or pending termination. If corrective action is possible, the letter should indicate the nature of that action and the timeline for completing the action(s). If the student decides*
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to withdraw, formal notification should be sent to the program and the Graduate School.

If the student decides to undertake corrective action, he or she should meet with his or her advisor and finalize a plan of action with accompanying deadlines. If the student decides to take corrective action but the advisor or program is unwilling to continue the student, the student may appeal to the Department Head. If the Department Head denies reinstatement, the student may appeal to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, pursue mediation or file a formal grievance.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The faculty and staff of the UO Special Education Program strive to create an environment of trust, respect, and collegiality. It is our hope that when disagreements, disputes, and other concerns occur, that they may be resolved informally to the satisfaction of the parties involved. We also recognize that there may be times when such disagreements, disputes, and concerns cannot be adequately resolved through informal means. The University of Oregon and the College of Education have established procedures that students may follow if they are dissatisfied with decisions of the faculty, course or progress evaluations they have received, interactions with faculty members or other students, and issues related to the policies and climate within the College. There are several established resources and procedures available to students to assist in resolving disputes and concerns. This section includes details on these resources and supports. Graduate students may also consult with the Dean of the Graduate School in trying to achieve an informal solution to their problem.

Mediation and Conflict Resolution

The UO Office of Student Life has a conflict resolution program, an informal, voluntary and confidential process to assist individuals and groups work through conflict, plan for the future, or make decisions. Students have used CRS to help resolve a wide variety of conflicts such as conflicts with friends or roommates, disagreements among students and professors, issues regarding custody and/or divorce, conflicts related to university housing,
workplace conflicts, conflict within or among student or workgroups. Specifically, CRS offers mediation and facilitation services, in addition to workshops, classes and coaching related to communication and conflict resolution. For information regarding the conflict resolution program, go to the website at http://studentlife.uoregon.edu/SupportandEducation/StudentConflictResolutionServices/tabid/134/Default.aspx, or call the program at (541) 346-0617.

**Other Resources**

**Grades.** If the concern pertains to a disputed grade, the student should make every effort to resolve disagreement with the faculty member who assigned the grade. If this effort is not successful, the student(s) may talk with a member of the Office of Academic Advising and Student Services (364 Oregon Hall, 346-3211) about appropriate petitioning procedures.

** Discrimination.** If any student enrolled at the University of Oregon believes s/he has been discriminated against on the basis of age, sex, sexual orientation, race or ethnicity, marital status, religion, handicap, or national origin, s/he may file a report with the UO Bias Response Team, who will respond to the action within 24 hours. Reports are filed on the BRT’s website at http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~brt/.

**Formal Academic Grievance Procedures**

The processes and timelines for initiating and responding to formal academic grievances by students are governed by State of Oregon Administrative Regulations (OAR) and are listed in detail in the Oregon University System’s STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE OAR-571-03-100. For more information on grievance procedures, go to http://education.uoregon.edu/feature.htm?id=399. From this COE page, there is a link to the OAR’s - the complete text for these procedures is listed under “Student Grievance Procedures.”
A paper copy of these grievance procedures may also be requested from the program director or department head. No student shall be penalized or discriminated against for utilizing this procedure.

*The student should make every effort to resolve the disagreement with the faculty member with whom they have the issue. If this effort is not successful, then the student can proceed with the formal grievance process.*

Following is a condensed version of the formal graduate student academic grievance procedure:

(a) **Step One**: The graduate student shall file a written grievance with the department head, department grievance committee, the college/ school grievance committee, or the dean, whichever is applicable:

(A) The student's statement of the grievance shall comply with the requirements of OAR 571-003-0100(2)(a);

(B) A University employee who receives a grievance under this rule which alleges illegal discrimination against a student including sexual harassment, shall send a copy of the grievance to the Assistant to the President for Legal Affairs and to the Office of Affirmative Action;

(C) The decision rendered at Step One shall be in writing and shall be provided to the aggrieved and all other named parties to the grievance within 30 days of the receipt of the formal grievance.

(b) **Step Two**: If the aggrieved graduate student is dissatisfied with the decision at Step One, the aggrieved shall file a written appeal of that decision to the dean of the school/college, or if the dean made the decision at Step One, to the Dean of the Graduate School, within 14 days of receipt of the decision made at Step One:

(A) The dean to whom the appeal is addressed may decide the grievance on the record presented or may investigate the grievance, appoint a designee to investigate, or refer the grievance to an appropriate committee or group to investigate;

(B) The decision rendered by the dean to whom the appeal was addressed shall be in writing and shall be provided to the aggrieved
and all other named parties to the grievance within 30 days of the receipt of the formal grievance;

(C) If the appeal is to the Dean of the Graduate School, see the procedure set forth in subsection (c) of this section.

(c) **Step Three**: If the graduate student aggrieved is dissatisfied with the decision at Step Two, the aggrieved shall file a written appeal of that decision to the Dean of the Graduate School within 14 days of receipt of the decision at Step Two, but if the Dean of the Graduate School made the decision at Step Two, the aggrieved may proceed to Step Four:

(A) The Dean of the Graduate School or the Dean's designee shall appoint an ad hoc Advisory Committee normally composed of three members selected from the Graduate Council (one student and two faculty members or three faculty members) to investigate the grievance and to make a recommendation to the Dean of the Graduate School, within 15 days of receipt of the decision made at the prior step;

(B) The Dean of the Graduate School shall render a decision, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the appeal, and provide copies of the decision to all the parties named in the grievance.

(d) **Step Four**: If either party is dissatisfied with the Dean of the Graduate School's decision, an appeal may be made to the Provost by filing a written appeal within 14 days of receiving the decision at Step Three. The Provost may decide the grievance on the record already developed or may investigate further, or designate another to investigate. The Provost shall provide a copy of the decision at this level to all the parties named in the grievance within 45 days of receiving the appeal. The Provost's decision shall be final.
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 proper application forms for international Students. Application forms can be found at: [http://international.uoregon.edu](http://international.uoregon.edu)

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 Affairs about immigration and Naturalization Service regulations and minimum credit requirements. The OIP can be contacted at: 541-346-3206 or online at: [http://international.uoregon.edu](http://international.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.
- The program may be able only to partially support conference travel.
**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/](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](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 for the Protection of Human Subjects as early as possible. The web site is: http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/

Research projects can be discussed and alternative procedures suggested. Also, the research often can be designed to 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 OPHS 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 that 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 is 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 for the Protection of Human Subjects.

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 or via email 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 for the Protection of Human Subjects before the project is initiated. International research needs documentation of permission from local authorities and/or research visa.

Review Categories
Proposed projects submitted to OPHS 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 OPHS determines that the protocol is exempt under the federal regulations. If the protocol is satisfactory, OPHS 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 OPHS at (541) 346-2510 if you have questions regarding the review categories.

How to Contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects: most of the information and applications you need are on the web at: http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/

Street Address:  
1600 Millrace Drive, Suite 105, Eugene, OR 97403  
Phone: 541.346.2510  
FAX: 541.346.6224  
human_subjects@orc.uoregon.edu

Mailing Address:  
Office for Protection of Human Subjects  
5237 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403
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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>
</table>
|                | **1. Program Approval** - College of Education Requirement  
All doctoral candidates must file a Doctoral Program Plan approved by their advisor and/or program committee. |
|                | **2. Establish Residency** - Graduate school Requirement  
For the Ph.D degree, the student must complete at least 3 years of full-time graduate level academic work beyond the bachelor's degree, of which at least one academic year must be spent in residence on the Eugene campus after the student has been classified as a conditionally or unconditionally admitted student in the doctoral program. One academic year consists of three consecutive terms of full-time study, with a minimum of 9 completed graduate credits per term. |
|                | **3. Comprehensive Examination/Portfolio Completion**  
a. Students must have completed most or all course work before doing doctoral comprehensive exams/portfolio requirements.  
b. All doctoral candidates must complete a series of doctoral examinations per individual department requirements.  
THE TERM YOU TAKE YOUR DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS, YOU MUST BE REGISTERED FOR A MINIMUM OF THREE GRADUATE HOURS. WORK SHOULD NOT BE DONE DURING ACADEMIC BREAKS.  
After faculty have read and passed all sections of doctoral comprehensive examination, the student will be advanced to candidacy. They will be notified by receipt of a letter from the Graduate School. |
|                | **4. Continuous Enrollment**  
Doctoral candidates must maintain continuous enrollment. If the student does not wish to enroll for one or more terms, he/she must obtain an Application for On-leave Status from the program secretary or Graduate School website, complete it and have it filed with the Grad School. On-leave forms are valid for a maximum of three terms, excluding summer. Once a student is advanced to candidacy, only three more terms are allowed for leave. After advancement, the doctoral student can register for no more than three terms of “In Absentia” at a reduced fee. |
|                | **5. Dissertation Committee**  
After advancement to candidacy, you must select a dissertation committee. The student must complete the “Dissertation Committee Appointment Form”, which can be obtained from the program secretary |
or COE website. This form should be signed by the Department Head, and then the SPED academic secretary will enter the committee into Gradweb.

The dissertation committee: Chairperson and one other member must be from the SPED major. The outside member must be from outside the department. 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 or COE website 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 your advisor or the Office for Protection of Human Subjects at 346-2510. An electronic version of the form is available on the internet at: [http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/](http://www.uoregon.edu/~humansub/). Please note that there are deadlines each term for committee review.

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

9. **Application for Advanced Degree**
   Apply for your degree online in Gradweb by the 2nd Friday of the term. Deadlines for this are also online.

10. **Oral Defense**
    Determine a time, place, and date for your oral defense by coordinating with all your committee members. This is all done online in Gradweb. The defense is scheduled, and committee members receive an email prompting them to log in and confirm attendance. Once everyone confirms, the SPED academic secretary receives an email prompt to print out the Application for Oral Defense, which is then signed by the Graduate Program Director. This signed form along with 2 signed copies of abstract are submitted to the Grad School 3 weeks before date of 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.** |
## Special Education Doctoral Program Plan

**STUDENT NAME:** ______________________________________________________

### AY 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></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>

**TOTAL CREDITS**

### AY 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></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>

**TOTAL CREDITS**

### AY 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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></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>

**TOTAL CREDITS**
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 importance to the field of EI/ECSE. Students assist in selecting topics and reading assignments and participate in weekly discussions.

Early Intervention Methods I, II, III, IV  
Course Numbers: SPED 687, SPED 688, SPED 689, SPED 690  
Terms Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer  
The methods courses are an integral component of student’ 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 Numbers: SPED 684 and SPED 685  
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: Spring  
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.</td>
<td>Conduct Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Complete Course Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Conduct Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Participate in Ongoing Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Conduct Pilot Research Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Participate on Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Write Policy Paper (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Vita/Goal Statement</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.

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

<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>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</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>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>program developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researcher/evaluator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The core course work provided useful information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. The faculty/staff provided adequate supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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>
</table>
# Early Intervention/Special Education Program Plan Schedule

(\textit{\textbf{fill in blanks that activities will be completed}})

\textbf{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>\quad • Goal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • List of course work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • 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>\quad • Review program plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • 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>\quad • Core coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • Concept Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • Research courses</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>\quad • Completed activities/products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • 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>\quad • 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>\quad • Supporting literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • Expected results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\quad • 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.

<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>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8</td>
<td>9 10 11</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 and Clinical Sciences Department
College of Education
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 and Clinical Services Department
5253 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
(541) 346-0807
Your_email@uoregon.edu

(add pages as needed)
Appendix F

SPED Remediation, Retention, and Dismissal policy

Please see the following website for grievance policies:
http://education.uoregon.edu/feature.htm?id=399