

ID# \_\_\_\_\_ (please use the last four digits of your SS#)

State \_\_\_\_\_

### Six Month Post-Institute Assessment

The **New Scripts** (New Scripts for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Services: An Innovative Model for Supporting Change and Reform in Interprofessional Preservice Training) project is interested in your responses to the following questions. Please make every effort to complete each question.

**Part I. Early Childhood/Early Intervention Content Areas** For each of the following content areas, please rate your current level of knowledge and skill.

Content Areas	Current Level of Knowledge and Skill				
	Low	Medium	High		
1. Family-centered practices	1	2	3	4	5
2. IFSP/IEP (developing plans with families)	1	2	3	4	5
3. IDEA, laws, and regulations	1	2	3	4	5
4. Inclusion/Natural environments	1	2	3	4	5
5. Service coordination	1	2	3	4	5
6. Cultural diversity	1	2	3	4	5
7. Interdisciplinary teaming	1	2	3	4	5
8. Interagency collaboration	1	2	3	4	5
9. Assessment/Evaluation (gathering information with families)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Transitions	1	2	3	4	5
11. Child development/Early brain development	1	2	3	4	5

**Part II. Early Childhood/Early Intervention Systemic Issues** For each of the following systemic issues, please provide a rating for your current level of knowledge and skill.

Systemic Issues	Current Level of Knowledge and Skill				
	Low	Medium	High		
1. The early childhood/early intervention system in your state	1	2	3	4	5
2. Personnel preparation plans and structures in your state (such as CSPD, career lattice, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
3. Licensure, certification or credentialing requirements in your state	1	2	3	4	5
4. Program evaluation & monitoring strategies	1	2	3	4	5

**Part III. Instructional Approaches for Early Childhood/Early Intervention** For each of the following instructional approaches please provide a rating for your current level of knowledge and skill.

Instructional Approaches	Current Level of Knowledge and Skill				
	Low	Medium	High		
1. Principles of adult learning	1	2	3	4	5
2. Self-assessment procedures	1	2	3	4	5
3. Families as co-teachers	1	2	3	4	5
4. Cross-discipline co-teaching	1	2	3	4	5
5. Case method of instruction	1	2	3	4	5
6. Team training (training of entire team)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Interactive techniques (e.g., role playing)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Distance education	1	2	3	4	5
9. Consultative approaches	1	2	3	4	5
10. Practica/field experiences in diverse community placements	1	2	3	4	5

## Part IV. Past *Preservice* Training Activities

We'd like to learn more about how much you've been involved in preparing students to work with young children and families as part of teaching, co-teaching, practicum experiences, or other preservice efforts.

1. Since June of 2000 (in the last six months), how have you been involved in preparing students to work with young children and families?	<input type="checkbox"/> No involvement *	<input type="checkbox"/> Taught or co-taught coursework
	<input type="checkbox"/> Supervised students	<input type="checkbox"/> Participated in practicum
	<input type="checkbox"/> Family as faculty	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)

\*If you answered "no involvement", please go directly to Part V. If you had any involvement, please circle the best answer to the following questions based on your **preservice education** (teaching, co-teaching, supervision, practica) activities of the past six months.

Think about the <i>preservice education</i> you provided.					
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always
2. To what extent was it coordinated with a state personnel development plan?	1	2	3	4	5
3. To what extent were certification or licensure credits available to students?	1	2	3	4	5
4. To what extent did you work as part of an interdisciplinary teaching team?	1	2	3	4	5
5. To what extent were family members of children with disabilities part of the teaching team?	1	2	3	4	5
6. To what extent were the students interdisciplinary (i.e., representatives from two or more disciplines)?	1	2	3	4	5
7. To what extent were active learning approaches (experiential activities, modeling, demonstrations) used?	1	2	3	4	5
8. To what extent were strategies for embedding or applying new ideas in practical work settings included?	1	2	3	4	5
9. To what extent were activities varied and sequenced to support students with different learning styles?	1	2	3	4	5
10. To what extent did students develop action plans for specific ideas to try in practical work settings?	1	2	3	4	5
11. To what extent was ongoing support, monitoring, or technical assistance provided to students afterwards?	1	2	3	4	5
12. To what extent was the impact of instruction on the practices of students measured or evaluated?	1	2	3	4	5
13. To what extent was the instruction individualized according to the needs of students?	1	2	3	4	5
14. To what extent was content related to cultural and linguistic diversity included?	1	2	3	4	5
15. To what extent was a family-centered philosophy infused in all experiences?	1	2	3	4	5

## Part V. Past *Inservice* Training Activities

We'd like to learn more about how much you've been involved in training people who work with young children and families as part of workshops and presentations.

1. Since June of 2000 (in the last six months), how much time have you spent training people who work with young children (0-9) and families?	<input type="checkbox"/> No time*	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 day	<input type="checkbox"/> 2-5 days
	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 -10 days	<input type="checkbox"/> 11 or more days	

\*If you answered “no time”, please ignore the remaining questions. If you had any involvement, please answer the following questions based on your *inservice training* (workshops, presentations, consultation, staff development) activities of the past six months.

Think about the <i>inservice training</i> you provided.					
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always
2. To what extent was it coordinated with a state personnel development plan?	1	2	3	4	5
3. To what extent were certification or licensure credits available to the participants?	1	2	3	4	5
4. To what extent did you work as part of an interdisciplinary training team?	1	2	3	4	5
5. To what extent were family members of children with disabilities part of the training team?	1	2	3	4	5
6. To what extent did the participants include groups that work together?	1	2	3	4	5
7. To what extent were participants interdisciplinary (i.e., good representation from two or more disciplines)?	1	2	3	4	5
8. To what extent were family members involved as participants?	1	2	3	4	5
9. To what extent was the training actively endorsed by administrators?	1	2	3	4	5
10. To what extent was the training actively attended by administrators?	1	2	3	4	5
11. To what extent were active learning approaches (experiential activities, modeling, demonstration) used?	1	2	3	4	5
12. To what extent were strategies for embedding or applying new ideas in practical work settings included?	1	2	3	4	5
13. To what extent were activities varied and sequenced to support students with different learning styles?	1	2	3	4	5
14. To what extent did participants develop action plans for specific ideas to try in practical work settings?	1	2	3	4	5
15. To what extent was ongoing support, monitoring, or technical assistance provided to participants afterwards?	1	2	3	4	5
16. To what extent was the impact of the training on the practices of participants measured or evaluated?	1	2	3	4	5
17. To what extent were handouts and written materials provided to participants?	1	2	3	4	5
18. To what extent was content related to cultural and linguistic diversity included?	1	2	3	4	5
19. To what extent was a family-centered philosophy infused in all experiences?	1	2	3	4	5