

National Professional Development Center on Inclusion

Helping states achieve an integrated professional development system that supports high quality inclusion



Results from The Oregon Landscape: Fall 2011

Background

The purpose of this survey conducted in fall 2011 was to gather information across multiple sectors to produce a descriptive landscape of early childhood professional development (PD) in Oregon. A total of 145 early childhood PD providers responded to the survey (see method section for additional details). These PD providers answered questions about the characteristics of the learners (the *who*), the content of the PD (the *what*), and the methods used to promote the acquisition and application of knowledge and skills in practice (the *how*).

WHO were the learners who participated in professional development activities?

- The vast majority of learners in PD were reported to be practitioners (92%); other learners were reported to participate in PD by fewer than one-half of the PD providers. (These included administrators [42%], family members [31%], PD providers [24%], specialists [14%], and other [12%].)a
- Of the practitioners, almost one-third had a 2-year, 4-year, or graduate degree (28%) and an early childhood and/or early intervention license, credential, or endorsement (29%). The majority of practitioners served pre-K children and infants and toddlers, whereas approximately one-half served children in kindergarten and higher. Most practitioners served children and families who were diverse with respect to a variety of factors (e.g., income, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, ability level), and the majority worked in center-based programs (e.g., child care, Head Start, preschool), as opposed to home-based or early intervention programs.

Information Specifically about Learners Identified as Practitioners

Practitioners' Level of Education

Graduate degree	5%
4-year degree	12%
2-year degree	11%
Some college	41%
High School	21%
Don't know	9%

Practitioners' Work Settings^a

Child care centers and homes	82%
Head Start or Early Head Start	68%
Private preschools	65%
Public Pre-K programs	38%
Home visiting/family support	31%
Preschool for children with disabilities (Part B)	23%
Early intervention (Part C)	23%
K and/or primary grades	22%
Other	9%

Age Groups

Practitioners Served^a

Infants/toddlers	84%
Pre-K	94%
K–3rd grade or higher	53%

Groups of Children and Families

Practitioners Served^a

Low income	96%
Diverse race, ethnicity, culture	89%
English Language Learners	81%
Identified disabilities/delays	71%
At risk for learning difficulties or challenging behaviors	71%
Children with special health care needs	46%
Don't know	1%

WHAT was the content of the professional development?

- More than four-fifths of PD content focused on knowledge about children’s development and learning, working with families, and general classroom practices, whereas approximately two-thirds or less of the PD activities focused on practices to address diverse learning needs (e.g., strategies for working with children with identified disabilities, and children from diverse cultural and linguistic groups).
- More than one-half of PD providers drew on the NAEYC Developmentally Appropriate Practice, their state’s professional competencies, and their state’s early learning guidelines/standards to guide their PD activities; approximately one-third or less relied on the Head Start Child Outcomes framework, or the DEC Recommended Practices.

Content Areas Covered in PD^a

Knowledge about children’s development and learning	88%
Strategies for collaborating, communicating with, and/or supporting families	85%
Strategies for improving general classroom practices, learning environments, and program quality to support development and learning for all children	83%
Knowledge about children’s health, safety, and nutrition	66%
Strategies for collaborating and communicating with other professionals	65%
Strategies for improving inclusion, participation, and learning for children with identified disabilities	62%
Strategies for improving inclusion, participation, and learning for children from diverse cultural and linguistic groups	59%
Strategies for improving inclusion, participation, and learning for children at risk for learning disabilities or with challenging behaviors	57%
Assessment approaches	46%
Other	11%

Professional and Program Standards/Competencies on Which PD Was Based^a

NAEYC Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs	71%
Your state’s professional competencies or core body of knowledge for early childhood	64%
Your state’s early learning guidelines/standards	49%
Head Start Child Outcomes Framework and Head Start Program Performance Standards	38%
NAEYC personnel standards	36%
Your state’s Quality Rating System (QRS) or Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS)	28%
DEC Recommended Practices	19%
Office of Special Education Programs outcomes for children with disabilities	10%
DEC personnel standards	10%
Other	15%

HOW were professional development activities delivered?

- Almost all PD activities were organized as courses, workshops, or institutes. Approximately one-half incorporated models of collaboration (e.g., coaching, mentoring, consultation) and technical assistance. Fewer PD providers used other approaches, such as distance learning, co-teaching, and communities of practice.
- PD activities involved a variety of teaching strategies, with print materials, large and small group discussions and/or activities, and lectures mentioned by three-fourths or more of respondents.
- More than one-half of the PD delivered consisted of one-time events on a particular topic with or without some follow-up activities; whereas very few PD activities on a particular topic provided ongoing instruction or long-term PD support. The majority of PD providers offered follow-up support/technical assistance (TA) onsite/in person (79%), via email (76%), or by phone (65%); whereas fewer offered follow-up support/TA via regular mail (28%).^a
- Most PD activities offered state approved/required training credits (40%); some offered certificates of participation (32%); fewer offered college or university credits (12%) or continuing education credits (8%).

Primary Approaches Used in PD^a

Courses, workshops, or institutes	93%
Coaching	54%
Technical assistance	51%
Mentoring	51%
Consultation	48%
Distance learning approaches	25%
Co-teaching	20%
Communities of practice/practitioner study groups	20%
Other	4%

Level of Intensity of PD on a Particular Topic

1-time PD event with or without some follow-up activities	55%
Multiple PD sessions, but less than a full semester course	22%
Full semester course and/or long-term PD support	14%
Other	9%

Teaching Strategies Used in PD^a

Print materials	96%
Large and small group discussions	92%
Large and small group activities	89%
Lectures	73%
Video demonstrations	63%
Case method of instruction	61%
Individual or group assignments	59%
Role play	58%
Web resources, or online literature searches	50%
Networking opportunities	47%
Field assignments, homework, back-home or action plans	44%
Guidance and feedback on instructional or intervention practices	43%
Structured opportunities to interact with and learn from families of young children	26%
Other	5%

Key contexts and supports for professional development

A majority of respondents said: (a) they were aware of organizational or agency resources that could be used to support the PD they provided (64%); (b) they were aware of specific local, state, or federal policies and initiatives that influenced how they approached PD (63%); (c) there were incentives available to encourage participation in the PD they provided (60%); and (d) the PD they provided was coordinated across multiple agencies, institutions, or disciplines (53%). A majority also said they publicized (60%) and evaluated (85%) their PD activities.

Method

The National Professional Development Center on Inclusion conducted the 34-item Web-based Landscape survey using Qualtrics software. A state team identified potential PD providers in Oregon and these providers were invited via email to complete the Landscape online survey (482 emails were successfully sent). Of the 192 individuals who followed the link in the invitation email to the Web site with details about the survey, 145 responded to the survey^b (76% of those

who visited the Web site; 30% of the total number invited). See below for characteristics of survey respondents.

Characteristics of survey respondents

Sex

Female	96%
--------	-----

Age

Mean	52
SD	9
Range	22–68

Ethnicity

Not Hispanic or Latino	90%
Hispanic or Latino	10%

Race

White	88%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3%
Black/African American	2%
Other ^c	7%

Highest Level of Education

Graduate degree	54%
Bachelor's degree	31%
Associate's degree	7%
Some college	8%
High School	<1%

Discipline

Early Childhood Education/ Early Intervention	50%
Education/Special Education	17%
Social Work	10%
Psychology	4%
Health	2%
Allied Health	1%
Other	17%

Years in Early Childhood

Mean	23
SD	10
Range	2–45

Years Providing Early Childhood PD

Mean	14
SD	9
Range	1–42

Frequency of PD Provision Annually

Less than once per month	37%
1-2 times per month	29%
3-5 times or more per month	13%
More than 5 times per month	21%

Primary Employer

University, college, or community college	22%
Local or regional agency	17%
Self-employed independent contractor	17%
Child Care Resource & Referral	12%
State agency	12%
Federal agency	7%
Professional organization	5%
Other	13%

Held a State Credential as a PD Provider

Yes	61%
No	35%

Provided PD as Part of a State or Regional PD Network or System

Yes	65%
No	35%

Primary Network/System

Child Care Resource & Referral Network (CCR&R)	40%
Oregon Registry Trainer Program	33%
Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE)	6%
Oregon Child Development Coalition (OCDC, Migrant Head Start)	5%
Head Start	5%
Early Head Start	0%
Training and Technical Assistance Centers (T-TACs)	0%
Oregon Center for Children and Youth with Special Health Needs (OCCYSHN)	0%
Oregon Parent Training and Information Network (OR PTI)	0%
Tribal Head Start	0%
Other	10%

**County(ies) in which
Typically Provided PD^a**

Baker	10%
Benton	13%
Clackamas	28%
Clatsop	11%
Columbia	12%
Coos	12%
Crook	9%
Curry	8%
Deschutes	17%
Douglas	16%
Gilliam	8%
Grant	8%
Harney	9%
Hood River	13%
Jackson	18%
Jefferson	12%
Josephine	13%
Klamath	11%
Lake	7%
Lane	20%
Lincoln	12%
Linn	14%
Malheur	12%
Marion	26%
Morrow	9%
Multnomah	50%
Polk	17%
Sherman	8%
Tillamook	13%
Umatilla	14%
Union	10%
Wallowa	9%
Wasco	9%
Washington	38%
Wheeler	8%
Yamhill	18%

Additional information about the Landscape survey may be found at

<http://npdci.fpg.unc.edu/resources/planning-and-facilitation-tools>

This report was prepared in December 2011 by Heidi Hollingsworth at Elon University, and Virginia Buysse at the National Professional Development Center on Inclusion. For additional information, contact npdci@unc.edu

^a For some questions, respondents could check all that apply so percentages will not add up to 100.

^b Some respondents did not complete all items.

^c Japanese, Chinese, Other Asian, Other Pacific Islander, Multiracial, and Some other race.