This final report summarizes the activities of a federally funded project designed to prepare higher education faculty to serve as leaders in providing and promoting quality interprofessional preservice instruction in their states. SCRIPT enhanced and replicated a validated model that had previously been developed, implemented and evaluated in 20 states. The model used a systems change approach, designed to make a long lasting and meaningful impact on personnel preparation programs. SCRIPT prepared teams of higher education faculty, family members, practitioners and agency representatives from eight states to serve as leaders in providing early childhood (0-9) intervention training in their states. A total of 254 state-level early childhood intervention leaders and 109 interdisciplinary team members from Missouri, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Carolina, and North Dakota participated directly in SCRIPT activities. Documented benefits of participation included: (1) statistically significant increases in faculty knowledge and skills in early intervention content and training strategies; (2) greater faculty commitment to participating in community-based inservice and technical assistance activities; (3) higher quality preservice and inservice training; and (4) increased linkages among state agencies, institutions of higher education, and consumers for personnel preparation at the state level. This report describes the project's training model, activities and participants, and discusses its goals and objectives, conceptual framework, dissemination activities, challenges, evaluation results, and impact. An appendix includes preservice and inservice personnel preparation quality indicators. (Contains 37 references.) (SG)
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ABSTRACT

The SCRIPT model was designed to prepare higher education faculty to serve as leaders in providing and promoting quality interprofessional preservice instruction in their states. The model employed a systems change approach, designed to make a long lasting and meaningful impact on personnel preparation programs. The goals of this project were: (1) to develop and field test a technical assistance approach for assisting faculty in making changes at state, community, institution (university/community college) and individual levels related to improving the preservice instruction available to their students; (2) to systematically evaluate all project methods, activities and materials; and (3) to disseminate information on effective strategies for promoting improvements in preservice instruction nationwide.

SCRIPT prepared teams of higher education faculty, family members, practitioners and agency representatives from eight states to serve as leaders in providing early childhood intervention (0 - 9) training in their states. This project enhanced and replicated a validated model that had previously been developed, implemented and evaluated in 20 states. Targeted outcomes of this project were: (1) to facilitate linkages among institutions of higher education, families, practitioners and agencies (community, state); (2) to increase higher education faculty members' knowledge and skills related to innovative, family-centered, interdisciplinary early intervention content and instructional strategies; and (3) to assist faculty in applying what they learn to the preservice and inservice training they provide others. Critical features of the implementation plan for this project included the following: (1) generating support and a vision for early intervention personnel preparation from state leaders; (2) identifying state and individual needs related to that vision; (3) providing faculty with information and training experiences designed to meet those needs; (4) facilitating the development of action plans related to improving the quality of future personnel preparation activities; and (5) providing technical assistance in support of the action plans.

Three initial states (Missouri, Oklahoma, Wisconsin) were identified in the SCRIPT proposal; five additional states (Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota) were selected through a national solicitation process. A total of 254 state-level early childhood intervention leaders with personnel preparation responsibilities and 109 interdisciplinary team members (faculty, family, practitioners, agency representatives) participated directly in SCRIPT activities. Documented benefits of participation included: (1) statistically significant increases in faculty knowledge and skills in early intervention content and training strategies; (2) greater faculty commitment to participating in community-based inservice and technical assistance activities; (3) higher quality preservice and inservice training; and (4) increased linkages among state agencies, institutions of higher education, and consumers around personnel preparation at the state level.

In summary, the proposed project contributed significantly to improving preparation of personnel to educate young children with disabilities by advancing the knowledge base and quality practices at the community, regional and state levels.
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The three broad goals and accompanying objectives of the SCRIPT project were:

Goal I: To develop and field test a training and technical assistance approach for assisting faculty in making changes at university/community college, community and state levels related to improving the preservice training available to their students

Objective 1: Identify liaison(s) to SCRIPT from each Cohort One state
Objective 2: Identify the State Resource and Planning Team (SRPT) in each Cohort One state
Objective 3: Plan and conduct a meeting with the SRPT in each Cohort One state
Objective 4: Facilitate the selection of a team from each of the three Cohort One states
Objective 5: Develop the program for the training institute for Cohort One state teams
Objective 6: Identify and secure resources for the institute for Cohort One teams
Objective 7: Implement the training institute for Cohort One teams
Objective 8: Facilitate implementation of state technical assistance plans in Cohort One states
Objective 9: Facilitate the implementation of the team member plans in Cohort One states
Objective 10: Plan and conduct 12- and 18- month follow-up visits in Cohort One states
Objective 11: Solicit potential states for Cohort Two
Objective 12: Identify the liaison(s) to SCRIPT from each Cohort Two state
Objective 13: Identify the State Resource Planning Team (SRPT) in each Cohort Two state
Objective 14: Plan and conduct a meeting with the SRPT in each Cohort Two state
Objective 15: Select a team from each of the five Cohort Two states
Objective 16: Develop the program for the institute for Cohort Two state teams
Objective 17: Identify and secure resources for the training institute for Cohort Two teams
Objective 18: Implement the institute for Cohort Two teams
Objective 19: Facilitate implementation of state technical assistance plans in Cohort Two states
Objective 20: Facilitate the implementation of the team member plans in Cohort Two states
Objective 21: Plan and conduct 12-18-month follow-up visits in Cohort Two states

Goal II: To systematically evaluate all project methods, materials, and activities

Objective 1: Develop SCRIPT measures and protocols
Objective 2: Summarize and analyze Cohort One SRPT meetings and data
Objective 3: Conduct needs assessments with Cohort One institute participants
Objective 4: Evaluate the impact of the Cohort One training institute
Objective 5: Conduct Cohort One six-month follow-up evaluations
Objective 6: Conduct Cohort One 12- and 18-month evaluations
Objective 7: Summarize and analyze Cohort Two SRPT meetings and data
Objective 8: Conduct needs assessments with Cohort Two institute participants
Objective 9: Evaluate the impact of the Cohort Two training institute
Objective 10: Conduct Cohort Two six-month follow-up evaluations
Objective 11: Conduct Cohort Two 12- and 18-month evaluations
Objective 12: Analyze data from Cohorts One and Two
Objective 13: Evaluate dissemination efforts
Objective 14: Evaluate project administration and management

Goal III: To disseminate information on effective strategies for promoting improvements in preservice training nationwide

Objective 1: Disseminate training materials and information on an ongoing basis
Objective 2: Produce and disseminate Scripts for Successful Change
Objective 3: Disseminate information about project activities and effectiveness
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT

SCRIPT was based on a conceptual framework derived from the literature on systems change. The approach taken in the project was ecological, individualized and designed to produce documented, long-lasting, meaningful changes in early intervention personnel preparation based on the specific and individual needs of each of the participating states. The core values of the project included commitments to diversity, interprofessional participation, family-centered approaches, a comprehensive system of personnel development and an appreciation for existing initiatives. SCRIPT was conceptualized as an enhancement of the previously-funded SIFT (Southeastern Institute for Faculty Training) and SIFT-OUT (Southeastern Institute for Faculty Training Outreach) projects. It refined and expanded the model to additional states, while at the same time creating the opportunity for states to focus more extensively on strategies for supporting changes in preservice personnel preparation.

DESCRIPTION OF TRAINING MODEL, ACTIVITIES AND PARTICIPANTS

The SCRIPT systems change model consisted of six component parts, as illustrated in Figure 1. The rationale and research base supporting each component follows.

Part 1. Stakeholder Support and Vision
One of the challenges in implementing a multi-state model is being responsive to the unique and diverse needs and priorities of states. A systemic change model that does not build on and enhance existing early intervention personnel development efforts and is not supported by key personnel who hold power, money and authority at administrative levels is unlikely to be effective (Georgiades & Phillimore, 1975; Pizzo, Griffin, Keith, Argenta, & Szanton, 1993; Winton, 1990). Without administrative support, individuals receiving training in innovative content and instructional strategies may find themselves unable to implement these new ideas in their natural teaching, training and planning contexts.
Securing a liaison to facilitate our interactions with states and identifying and involving key state-level early intervention stakeholders were initial priorities. Each participating state was asked to identify an individual or individuals with time, resources and interest to invest in serving as a liaison to SCRIPT. Five of the eight states selected a single individual with statewide personnel preparation responsibilities (e.g., Part C coordinator, Part C CSPD coordinator, Part C personnel preparation consultant). Three states selected more than one liaison, drawing together individuals from different settings and different perspectives (e.g., campus, community and state agency).

Based on guidance provided by SCRIPT, each state's stakeholder group or SRPT (State Resource Planning Team) drew from agencies, disciplines and institutions within the state to include key early childhood and early intervention representatives with expertise, power and resources. Family representation and cultural diversity were required on each SRPT. In most states, a group of this type already existed in the form of an Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) or other personnel preparation committee. In those states, the liaison(s) used the SCRIPT opportunity to engage additional stakeholders with preservice interests. The SRPTs (n=224 total across the eight states with a range of 11-61) met three times over a 24-month period: 1) at the beginning of the project to identify state priorities for change; 2) six months after the SCRIPT institute to evaluate progress and assess the success of the SCRIPT project; and 3) 12-18 months after the institute to formulate plans for institutionalizing SCRIPT efforts.

A key purpose for the meeting was to enable stakeholders to exchange information about personnel preparation priorities, including current and planned initiatives and projects. This background helped stakeholders avoid duplication of efforts and prioritize desired changes in personnel preparation that were either enhancements of current efforts or new areas for improvement. State SRPT priorities are listed in Table 1. States used a variety of methods to determine travel team membership. Several states had a sub-group meet on the day following the SRPT meeting to make selections. One state had family-faculty-practitioner clusters apply together. Yet another used the sub-group process to identify faculty and practitioner representatives and used a self-application process to identify the family representatives. In each case, guidance from SRPT members regarding priorities played an important part in the composition of each team.

A related purpose of the meeting was to identify the travel team of faculty, family members, practitioners and state agency representatives who would represent the state at the SCRIPT institute and delineate plans for addressing the SRPT priorities. SCRIPT required that states select a team that represented multiple disciplines, cultural diversity and family members. Lead agency representation (Part C) was required, and 619/Part B representation was encouraged to support continuity and collaboration. SRPT members within each state were also given a chance to identify additional selection criteria that fit with their vision or plan for their state. Examples of criteria identified by states included geographical representation, willingness on faculty's part to devote a certain number of days to inservice training and linkages with existing state training initiatives.

A critical step in the model was conveying to travel team members why they were selected, what the expectations of them were from the state level and what the state priorities were that they were being asked to assist in addressing. An effective strategy in supporting travel team member participation was sending "boss/dean" letters on their behalf to administrators or supervisors of their choosing. These letters described the SCRIPT project and highlighted the unique leadership opportunity that participation would offer. These "boss/dean" letters legitimized participation and assisted travel team members, especially faculty, in obtaining travel support to attend the four-day SCRIPT institute. One hundred twenty-five "boss/dean" letters were individually crafted for members of SCRIPT teams, with excellent results (e.g., institutions supported travel for all participating faculty members).
Table 1. State Priorities for Improvement in Preservice Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Increase emphasis on early intervention laws, policies and effective practices, including natural environments, family content and diverse service delivery models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the variety of practica experiences (including family practica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide incentives to support the interdisciplinary focus in preservice training (across disciplines and across institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase links between preservice and inservice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Increase interdisciplinary course work and practica experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase quantity, quality and variety of hands-on experiences early in training (e.g., different settings, diverse families, home visits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase emphasis on serving infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities in inclusive environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Increase family involvement in preservice training (all disciplines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the quality and quantity of practical experiences for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share information about the most effective classroom and practical experiences for preparing students to work in early intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohort 2 States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Increase the emphasis on family-centered practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase opportunities for interdisciplinary and interagency learning experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen links between higher education and fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement a SCRIPT web page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Increase interdisciplinary collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the variety of preservice practica experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase opportunities for preservice faculty to experience both “tower” and “trench” growth opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase statewide collaboration among post-secondary institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Increase interdisciplinary planning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include family members and diverse discipline representatives as participants in all aspects of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the quality and diversity of practical experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist faculty members in addressing early intervention philosophical assumptions and competencies in all preservice training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist training institutions to plan, develop and implement early childhood education (ECE) unified endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Promote interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary preservice training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the effective exchange of information and ideas among researchers, faculty members, practitioners and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase accessibility to training to facilitate obtaining licensure and credentialling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Support early intervention preservice partnerships across disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand parents as co-trainers in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish standards for preservice programs for early intervention professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionalize the philosophy and early intervention competencies for professionals serving young children and their families through preservice training programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2. Needs Assessment (Community and Individual)

A key factor in designing effective training is ensuring that the training is responsive to the perceived needs of the trainees (Griffin, 1983; Kealoha & Haase, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). Upon selection, travel team members were asked to respond to a needs assessment measure related to content areas, instructional strategies and resources to which they would like exposure to enhance their ability to provide training to others.

- Initial priorities for content were: (top four in decreasing order of priority): assessment; interagency collaboration, family-centered practices and interdisciplinary teaming.
- Instructional strategies they prioritized were: families as co-instructors; cross-disciplinary co-teaching; team-based approaches and consultative approaches.
Resources they said would best help were: training resources (packaged curricula, videotapes, activities), other faculty/programs doing early childhood/early intervention training, family members with whom to co-teach and further training in relevant content.

The results of the needs assessment data, as well as the state priorities identified by SRPT members in each cohort of states, were used to design the four-day training institutes held each year.

Part 3. Infusion of Information and Resources to Meet Needs

An important consideration in assessing training needs is the extent to which it is possible to respond effectively to the identified needs. In his review of the literature on staff development and the process of change, Guskey (1986) said it is better not to collect needs assessment information if the needs cannot be addressed, simply because of the negative feelings that participants have when they feel that they took the time to share their needs and the information was ignored. Therefore, based on the state and individual needs, a four-day intensive training event, the SCRIPT institute was planned. Key features of this event were:

- **Instructional Sessions** – During the four-day SCRIPT institute, participants chose from 30-35 different instructional sessions (lasting from 1 - 2 1/2 hours). Sessions were organized around the priorities of participating states and the content areas that participants identified through the needs assessment. Expert consultants who were chosen for both their knowledge of the content area and their reputations as experienced trainers in those areas facilitated the sessions. Whenever possible, sessions were co-facilitated to model interdisciplinary and family-professional collaboration. Rather than the traditional content-focused emphasis, the sessions were organized around how to train others about the particular content area. A variety of innovative instructional strategies, reflecting principles of adult learning (Brookfield, 1993; Garrison, 1992; Knowles, 1980) and with a particular focus on strategies that were prioritized on the needs assessment, were demonstrated. For instance, a session might feature strategies that ranged from interactive activities and cooperative learning to backwards brainstorming or video clips. At the end of each session, participants had the opportunity to discuss strategies they saw modeled and how they might use them.

- **Interactive Library and Resource Guide** – In response to needs assessment data indicating that access to training materials was a priority for faculty, an interactive library of innovative, family-centered, interdisciplinary early intervention training resources was created. These materials were transported to the SCRIPT institute and were organized by content area in a large room reserved for this purpose. Chairs, tables, portable VCRs and time were available for participants to explore these resources in depth. In addition, the materials were catalogued in an accompanying Resource Guide (Catlett & Winton, 2001) that included brief descriptions and ordering information. What is notable about this collection of materials is that many are not commercially available and therefore, are not widely marketed or known to faculty. The majority were developed through grant-funded projects and thus available at reasonable purchase prices. (NOTE: The 7th (1998), 8th (1999) and 9th (2000) editions of the Resource Guide were revised and produced for SCRIPT participants. The current (2001) edition of this product is available to search or download at <www.fpg.unc.edu/Publications/Rguide/rguide.pdf>. Special collections that were included in the library included course syllabi, materials that have been translated into Spanish and measures for evaluating training outcomes.)

- **Team-Building, Planning and Networking Time** – Participants indicated on the needs assessment that access to other faculty providing early intervention training was a resource that would help them in their training roles. Therefore, 8-10 hours during the SCRIPT institute were dedicated as team building and planning time. A large portion of this time was devoted to meetings of each state’s travel team that focused on
developing plans for addressing the early intervention personnel preparation priorities identified by the leaders in their states. This time also provided a natural context for sharing ideas and expertise across disciplines, agencies and institutions within their state. Time was also set aside for "issue" sessions at which participants from all states could convene around a special topic of interest to them.

In each state, SRPT members were asked to identify the 15-member travel team that would represent them at the four-day SCRIPT institute. SCRIPT required that states select a group that represented multiple disciplines, cultural diversity, family members, faculty members, practitioners and relevant state agencies (e.g., Part C, 619). SCRIPT defined "faculty" in an inclusive fashion so that practica supervisors and adjunct instructors were included. The 148 travel team members who participated from the eight states represented 14 different disciplines with a mean of 11.2 years of service delivery experience and 10.9 years of personnel preparation experience. Twenty-six percent were parents of children with disabilities, and there was nine percent minority representation (see Table 2).

Table 2. Number and Characteristics of Travel Team Members (Individuals Who Received Direct Training from the SCRIPT Project) (n = 148)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of a Child with a Disability</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Work Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agency</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Affiliated Program (UAP)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agency</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 4. Encouraging Practical Application of Ideas through Action Planning

The importance of linking the training to real life practices and experiences is another component that has been described as critical to the successful training experience (Pizzo, Griffin, Keith, Argenta, & Szanton, 1993; Winton, McWilliam, Harrison, Owens, & Bailey, 1992; Fullan, 1982; Hall & Hord, 1987; Havelock & Havelock, 1973; ZERO TO THREE/
The National Center for Clinical Infant Programs, 1991). Examples of the strategies used during the SCRIPT institute to promote and model this concept follow.

- **Making instructional materials accessible.** One strategy for making the materials accessible was to provide every participant with a handout set from each instructional session. The handouts were designed so participants could use them in their own training. For example, if a session facilitator used an overhead, a hard copy of the overhead was included in the handouts. Session facilitators also made extensive use of the instructional materials in the interactive library as a way of acquainting faculty with those resources.

- **Identifying short-term goals.** Another strategy for encouraging practical applications was to ask participants to identify specific goals they wanted to accomplish during the four-day training institute. On the first of the four days, participants were asked to write their personal goals on "Post-it" notes and place them in a strategic location where they could check on their progress. As part of their orientation to the four-day schedule of activities, they were reminded that time was theirs to spend in whatever ways would enable them to accomplish their objectives. Scheduled independent time, planned variety in the instructional sessions and opportunities to create sessions on topics of interest were all ways of conveying that participants were in charge of their own learning. The SCRIPT staff and invited facilitators structured the event to be flexible and responsive to adult learners (Garrison, 1992). This strategy helped the participants focus on the aspects of the institute experience that had the most practical application.

- **Identifying long-term goals.** Another strategy was to request that participants develop a specific plan for how they would use what they had discovered at the SCRIPT institute in their states. This planning process took place both at a state level and at an individual level. Each state team was asked to develop a state action plan that provided timelines, objectives and denoted responsibilities related to addressing state priorities. In addition to state plans, participants were asked to develop individualized "Back Home" plans that specified personal objectives related to preservice or inservice early intervention training that were inspired by their SCRIPT experience. Some examples of personal goals identified included: (a) revising assessment courses to include family-centered content; (b) inviting parents to present or co-instruct; and (c) inviting colleagues from other disciplines to plan and implement a workshop. Participants received two documents: the "Checklist of Quality Indicators Related to Early Intervention Inservice Training" and the "Checklist of Quality Indicators Related to Early Intervention Preservice Training" (see Appendix A) that served as checklists to use when they were planning training and as reminders of what they might advocate for when they participated in policy or planning groups.

**Part 5. Providing Follow-up Support and Technical Assistance**

Providing follow-up support and technical assistance is a critical component to ensuring application of learning (Wolfe & Snyder, 1997). An earlier project (SIFT) provided ongoing support for a period of six months after the training institute. Project evaluation confirmed that six months is a very short time to achieve (or expect to achieve) systemic change. For this reason, SCRIPT implemented several changes in the sequence of follow-up supports. First, SCRIPT extended the follow-up period to 18 months. States were required to participate in one face-to-face meeting six months after the SCRIPT institute and a second meeting 12-18 months after the institute. The first meeting provided an opportunity for travel team members to recap what they learned at the SCRIPT institute and review progress on their plans for change with the leaders (SRPT and others) in their states. Participants in that meeting were asked to evaluate the success of the state plan, to identify barriers and facilitators related to accomplishing the plan and to identify "next steps" in terms of early intervention personnel preparation in the state. This meeting also provided an opportunity to discuss how to use the $3,000 mini-grant provided to each state by SCRIPT to support progress on state plans.
Often when grant-funded projects end, the innovations or efforts that were being promoted dissipate or disappear. A case in point is research on the fate of 10 interdisciplinary early intervention preservice programs studied by Rooney (1994). At the end of the funding period, 9 of 10 had reverted to traditional training programs; the interdisciplinary aspects had vanished without the grant support. The second meeting, which also brought together travel team members and SRPT members, was designed to provide updates on state plans and a thoughtful forum for discussion of institutionalizing SCRIPT efforts.

A third follow-up support strategy was the ongoing technical assistance through telephone and e-mail contact and newsletter exchange provided to all participants. This support was available to SRPT members and travel team members throughout the four-year grant period. At this time over 2,000 individuals are on the SCRIPT mailing list, reflecting, in part, the interest of deans, chairpersons and other administrators who requested information as a result of exposure to SCRIPT through boss/dean letters. SCRIPT responded to over 5,000 requests for technical assistance over the life of the project, most of which have focused on brainstorming with participants about activities, resources and strategies related to teaching and/or training they were planning or networking to create connections among faculty, families, practitioners and agencies.

Part 6. Evaluation Strategy

As illustrated in Figure 1, evaluation took place at and throughout every phase of implementation. Data are presented and findings discussed in the Evaluation Findings section of this document, which follows Methodological or Logistical Problems.

METHODOLOGICAL OR LOGISTICAL PROBLEMS

Changes in personnel in the participating states posed the largest single threat to the impact and continuity of SCRIPT. In several states, the liaison changed jobs or left the state. The loss of a leader with both the history of the project and the vision for implementing targeted changes was keenly felt in several SCRIPT states. No amount of additional support and cheerleading, we discovered, can make up for the loss of a dedicated advocate and ally within the state. Details of the impact of these shifts can be found in the Project Impact section of this report.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Outcomes from SCRIPT, documented through multi-method data collection strategies, indicate the model was effective. Highlights from these data are provided below.

Documentation – Records maintained by project staff document the timely accomplishment of all project goals and objectives were accomplished in a timely manner. Planned training and project management activities and tasks were conducted. Technical assistance requests (over 5,000 during the four years of the project), were completed. The SCRIPT project was also very successful in sharing information and materials with diverse audiences committed to early intervention personnel development.

Evidence of Change – Data were collected and analyzed to determine the extent to which three outcomes (see below) were achieved.

Outcome 1: Did the model increase the knowledge and skills of travel team members related to using innovative instructional approaches for delivering early childhood/early intervention content in their training programs?
Changes in the self-efficacy of individual travel team members were measured by asking them to rate their levels of knowledge and skill in several areas: (1) early childhood/early intervention content; (2) early childhood/early intervention systemic issues; and (3) instructional approaches for conveying content. In addition, travel team members were asked to rate their willingness to teach early childhood/early intervention content in preservice and inservice contexts. These data were collected from travel team members at two points in time to document change: baseline (prior to the training institute) and six months after the institute. Changes that were documented at the individual level included the following:

- Travel team members did increase their knowledge and skill in key early intervention content areas and innovative pedagogical approaches (Evidence: Changes in all 10 content areas, all four systems areas and all nine instructional approaches measured, p<.0000)
- Travel team members did increase their willingness to provide preservice, inservice and technical assistance related to early intervention as a result of the project (p<.0001)
- Travel team members provided more inservice in early intervention after participation in the project (p<.03)

**Outcome 2:** Did the model build the capacity of institutions of higher education to prepare students for leadership and practitioner roles in the areas of early childhood/early intervention and family support?

The true test of effectiveness of a project like SCRIPT is the extent to which new knowledge and skills are applied to real life settings. Pre- and six-month post-comparisons of reports of the preservice and inservice training practices used by faculty indicate that this did indeed occur. Training provided by SCRIPT travel team participants improved from pre to six-month post in terms of quality indicators identified in advance by the SCRIPT project. Specifically, travel team members were more likely to provide training that included:

- Used varied training strategies to match different learning styles of students (p<.0001)
- Individualized instruction according to the needs of the students (p<.02)
- Taught interdisciplinary audiences (3 or more disciplines) (p<.03)
- Included family members as part of the instructor team (p<.001)
- Coordinated training with the state Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) (p<.01)

Six-month follow-up data from individual participants also indicated that family involvement was an extremely important component. Ninety-eight percent of participants rated the impact that parents had on the work of the team during and after the institute at a “3” on a 1-3 scale with 3 being positive. Also, family members on the teams stayed involved in personnel preparation in their states (x=4.13 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being very involved).

**Outcome 3:** Did the model strengthen linkages among state agencies, institutions of higher education and consumers relative to preservice personnel at the state level?

At a systems level, State Resource Planning Team (SRPT) members completed a questionnaire about the state personnel preparation landscape (described in detail on page 5) prior to the SRPT meeting and again six months after their state’s travel team had returned from the SCRIPT institute. Comparison of pre-institute and six-month post-institute data revealed other statistically significant differences in personnel preparation activities in the state, including:

- CSPD is serving a more meaningful role (p<.0000)
• Increased cooperation and collaboration across agencies and institutions (p<.0000)
• Institutions of higher education (IHEs) were doing a more adequate job of providing preservice training (p<.005)
• Greater family participation in personnel preparation (p<.0000)
• Families had more opportunities to be involved in training
• Greater linkages between inservice and preservice efforts (p<.0000)
• More preservice (p<.01) and inservice (p<.0000) training linked with certification
• Family-centered philosophy is infused in preservice training (p<.000)
• More preservice activities are interdisciplinary (p<.001)

Interviews conducted with individual travel team members provide further evidence of increased capacity and linkages. Participants identified the major impact of the project. The responses are summarized below.
• Networking (mentioned by 38 percent of respondents)
• Applying new ideas/information (mentioned by 22 percent of respondents)
• Making systems level changes (mentioned by 18 percent of respondents)
• Increased support/motivation (mentioned by 16 percent of respondents)
• Increased big picture awareness (mentioned by 11 percent of respondents)

Application to Practice – The extent to which educational innovations actually become embedded within ongoing institutional and individual practices is discouraging (Gersten et al, 1995). For this reason, application to practice was an important part of the SCRIPT evaluation plan. Findings are summarized below.

• To what extent were travel team members able to implement their individual action plans related making changes in their own practices?
  Each travel team member developed an Individualized Back Home Plan at the end of the SCRIPT institute. Phone interviews were held six-months later to determine satisfaction with and progress on the goals each individual had set. The mean success rating across all goals for all participants was 3.38; their satisfaction was 3.29 (on a 1-5 scale with 5 being completely successful or satisfied).

Comments related to barriers and facilitators were also analyzed, to learn that:
• Organizational/system factors had the biggest impact on change in terms of both barriers (mentioned by 53 percent of respondents) and facilitators (mentioned by 36.2 percent of the respondents). Comments in this category related to resources (funding, technology, staff turnover), existing grants and initiatives and administrative and leadership support.

• Colleague-related factors was the second most frequently mentioned factor affecting change. The interest, enthusiasm and support of colleagues was more likely to be mentioned as a facilitator (27 percent of respondents) than a barrier (15.3 percent of respondents) to accomplishing new goals.

• Individual-related factors included participants describing things about themselves that were barriers (28.3 percent) to accomplishing their goals rather than facilitators (9.4 percent). Comments were often related to time and competing priorities.

• SCRIPT-related factors, including ongoing support and technical assistance, were described by 26 percent of participants as a facilitator to their progress.

• To what extent were states able to implement their state action plans related to making changes in their preservice personnel development systems?
  At the six-month follow-up meetings held in each state, the key leaders (SRPT members) rated progress on their state action plans. Specific state goals (x = 5.2 per state) were implemented with some success. Stakeholders also indicated the extent to which they felt the efforts started through SCRIPT would have a continuing impact (x = 4.1
on a 1-5 scale with 1 having no impact and 5 having a major impact). These quantitative findings are supported by qualitative evidence of lasting changes related to quality and collaboration in state personnel preparation efforts.

**PROJECT IMPACT**

Project impact is described in this section in terms of changes that have been facilitated in participating states, products developed and available, presentations, publications, and other indicators of the project’s effect on the field, on families, and ultimately on young children with disabilities. A final section summarizes the implications of findings by describing lessons learned through the *SCRIPT* project and promising strategies for future efforts.

**State Level Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Level Changes in Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Team members in Milwaukee used a “breakfast club” structure to meet, share ideas and support desired outcomes. One result of this was a three-year federal grant to support interdisciplinary instruction and collaboration at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee called Diverse Urban Interdisciplinary Training or DUIT. Other results include increased team and community practicum experiences for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In conjunction with <em>SCRIPT</em> staff, team members designed and implemented a one-day meeting with two purposes: 1) share methods, models and materials from the <em>SCRIPT</em> project; and 2) discuss the <em>SCRIPT</em> goal related to creating an infrastructure for addressing statewide personnel development issues. The decision of the group was to address the desire for a statewide infrastructure through a combination of approaches that use existing structures for some activities and create ad hoc groups for other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>SCRIPT</em> team members helped organize the first Intersecting Interests conference in Wisconsin to provide a mechanism for addressing systemic personnel development issues. That conference continues to be a vibrant annual forum for focusing on preservice and inservice professional development issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Change can be very disruptive. Within months of returning from the <em>SCRIPT</em> institute, the Part C coordinator was promoted, and two team members, one of whom was the liaison, left the state. Despite several team members working to keep things on track and the designation of a new person, the disruptions did not help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- History can be a factor in shaping what is possible. In the early 1990s, Wisconsin’s Waisman Center, through the Wisconsin Personnel Development Project (WPDP), played a major role in supporting <em>SCRIPT</em>-type priorities in preservice. However, when budgets were cut, the preservice funding they received disappeared. In some ways this may have made it more difficult to generate interest in and statewide support of preservice initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Too many initiatives can be a problem. When participants in the State Resource Planning Team (SRPT) meeting identified early childhood and early intervention personnel preparation projects and initiatives at state and regional levels, the list was endless. A challenge for Wisconsin team members was to look for ways to weave together many wonderful but segmented programs or find an area of personnel preparation that had not been targeted. One participant commented that it was hard to see “the forest for the trees”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Systems Level Changes in Iowa

- The Iowa Department of Education provided mini-grants to support innovations related to family involvement. Funds were used to reimburse parents for expenses, pay honoraria for co-presenting/teaching with professionals/faculty and increase preservice/inservice emphasis on family-centered practices. One institution (Loras College) received an award to support a parent co-instructor in early childhood courses. Based on the success of that collaboration, Loras College is currently supporting that parent's salary as a co-instructor. Another mini-grant supported an interdisciplinary institute at Briarcliff College, followed by interdisciplinary student assignments and projects.

- The Iowa Department of Education pursued participation in the Case Method of Instruction (CMI) Outreach Project, based on initial contact with the project's directors at the SCRIPT institute. The project provided training on the use of CMI to faculty throughout the state.

- A physical therapy faculty member at the University of Iowa implemented a family practicum experience (an instructional approach she discovered at the SCRIPT institute) for a few of her students. The success of that effort grew to include faculty from other disciplines. Ultimately, ongoing support for family practicum experiences for students in multiple disciplines was sought and obtained as part of the UAP's LEND grant.

- A two-day statewide faculty institute was provided for higher education representatives from all Iowa four-year institutions of higher education and many community colleges. Team members designed the program which included sessions on new content and new instructional processes (e.g., case method of instruction).

- Faculty and families designed, implemented and evaluated a statewide institute to prepare additional (n=35) family members for instructional roles. The FEEL (Family Experiences Enhance Learning) training was modified from a model developed by the Missouri SCRIPT team.

- A model for bringing faculty from different disciplines together around new teaching ideas was implemented by one SCRIPT team member at Kirkwood Community College. The success of that model led to a federally funded project to support further innovation.

- A web site was developed and launched to support networking and dissemination.

Lessons Learned

- A strong, dedicated state liaison who provided consistent support to Iowa team members was key to the changes that Iowa made.

- Difficulties with networking and collaboration early in the SCRIPT experience led the team to schedule frequent meetings (every other month). The Iowa Department of Education continues to help support these meetings.

- Effective teamwork and collaboration draw energy and interest. The Iowa SCRIPT team has grown to include representatives from additional institutions and initiatives, who are now active members. In Iowa, the acronym SCRIPT stands for Supporting Change and Reform in Iowa Preservice Training.

- The successes achieved by the Iowa team have led them to set new goals. To increase the number of community college faculty involved, Iowa will participate in the Natural Allies project, a systems change effort designed to infuse exceptionality in early childhood community college coursework and practica.
Systems Level Changes in Kentucky

- Kentucky fully accomplished all of their state goals.

- **SCRIPT** team members developed the Kentucky Institute of Early Childhood Professional Development (KIECPD). KIECPD acts as a sub-committee of the Early Childhood Advisory Council, which makes recommendations to the Early Childhood Branch of the Division of Extended Learning, Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and the Child Care Policy Council, which makes recommendations to the Cabinet for Families and Children (CFC). Representatives include: birth to two (First Steps, Part C), preschool programs (619), Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R), Cabinet for families and Children (state level child care agency), military, two- and four-year colleges and universities, Head Start and the Kentucky Association for Early Childhood Education (KAECE).

- A networking and information web site (http://www.kiecpd.org/) was launched. Conversations were held about how best to use the site to list professional development opportunities for Kentucky’s early care and education providers.

- Team members explored alternatives to existing patterns of accreditation. They discovered only expensive and time-consuming options.

- An initial draft of common core content areas was prepared. Team members met with colleagues on several occasions to obtain further input.

- Shifts to include stronger interdisciplinary and family involvement were implemented at several institutions of higher education.
  - An interdisciplinary summer practicum was implemented between University of Kentucky and Eastern Kentucky University.
  - Co-teaching, a parent resource directory and conference presentations on importance of family involvement were implemented at Eastern Kentucky University.
  - Co-teaching and team teaching increased at Northern Kentucky University.
  - Partnerships were established among Jefferson Community College, Region IV Head Start in Louisville and Kentucky State University

### Lessons Learned

- A consistent liaison helps keep efforts on track. The Kentucky liaison was employed by the Department of Education, which gave her access to resources that could help support **SCRIPT** efforts.

- Organizing a team so several members cluster in several locations is an effective strategy. As an example, an early childhood special education faculty member from a four-year institution and an early childhood faculty member from a community college were both part of the northern Kentucky cluster. During their time together they discovered their similarities, their differences and how they could work effectively together. One outcome of that collaboration was a presentation at a state early childhood conference entitled “I’m Not So Special and You’re Not So Regular”.

- Change in higher education is sometimes hardest to achieve at the largest, most powerful institutions. Kentucky was one of the states in which we learned that faculty at smaller institutions often have much greater flexibility in where they teach, what they teach, how they teach and with whom they teach.
Systems Level Changes in Missouri

- Some increased collaboration in preservice instruction was achieved. One example was a collaborative practicum between a rural institution of higher education (Southwest Missouri State University) and an urban institution of higher education (Webster University) that enabled students to learn about, see and discuss the barriers and facilitators to service delivery in each local. Some increased use of family members as instructional partners in preservice training was also achieved.

- A one-day conference for faculty was planned and implemented. This provided opportunities for sharing methods, models and materials discovered at the SCRIPT institute, a chance for faculty members to exchange syllabi and a way to enhance networking around emerging state issues and priorities (licensure, certification, Part C redesign).

- Team members organized a two-day statewide workshop to prepare parents for preservice training roles. FEEL (Family Experiences Enhance Learning) was supported by Part C funds. As a follow-up support, mini-grants ($500) were made available to faculty members to support family partners. Initial awards were made to faculty at seven institutions of higher education.

Lessons Learned

- Even with a strong and supportive liaison, some states show less systemic change than others. Missouri is an example of a state where more significant changes may have occurred at the individual level than the state level. As an example, a faculty member who had never collaborated in her teaching with family members now does so regularly. She has also gone on to be a key state inservice provider, training as part of a faculty-family-provider team.

- Sharing an effective state-specific model can be an effective way to help other states make similar changes. Information about the FEEL model, mentioned above, was shared with other states that were interested in supporting increased family involvement. To date (11/01) the model has been fully replicated in one state (Iowa) and is being considered for replication in three others (DE, SC, WV).

- Interest in supporting change at individual and state levels has been evident in unexpected ways. Missouri was one of four states to seek SCRIPT assistance in organizing an institute to provide faculty from geographically contiguous Midwest states (IA, NE, MO, OK) with new information and resources. With participation from a fifth neighboring state (Kansas) and support from state agencies and the regional Head Start program, extremely successful two-day Midwest Faculty Institutes were held in November 2000 and 2001. SCRIPT staff organized and supported the planning for both events.
Systems Level Changes in Nebraska

- A successful two-day “knowledge transfer” workshop (Building on Family Strengths) was held for family, faculty and community partners through the state. The event, planned by SCRIPT staff and members of the Nebraska SCRIPT team, offered an opportunity to share methods, models and materials from the SCRIPT institute.

- In February 1999, the Nebraska Department of Education (Office of Special Populations, Office of Children and Families) solicited applications to create, restructure, and improve interdisciplinary course work and practica experiences in community colleges and universities and to support collaboration among all major stakeholders - faculty, families, practitioners, and administrators - in early intervention/early childhood preservice training. Awards for seven SCRIPT grants were made on June 1, 1999. Projects are designed to stimulate interdisciplinary coursework and practica that are family-centered, community-based, and culturally and developmentally appropriate. Progress to date includes:
  - Development of a certified early childhood endorsement program between Wayne State College & Northeast Community College
  - Members of the University of Nebraska-Omaha project orchestrated two interdisciplinary higher education symposia (August 1999, March 2000) for faculty, family members and practitioners. Another accomplishment was planning with four other institutions of higher education (College of St. Mary’s, Creighton, Iowa Western Community College, & Metro Community College) toward an integrated system of community-based preservice education. The focus is on articulation agreements, syllabi and developing a dictionary of community services.
  - Planning by faculty at the University of Nebraska Medical Campus, Creighton, and College of St. Mary’s for the development of interactive problem-based modules/case studies to use with MD, RN, OT, and PT students.
  - University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UN-L) coordinated support for students and co-instruction in graduate-level courses on family-centered services and medically-fragile infants across four campuses (UNK, UNL, UNMC, UNO) and 11 departments. A second UN-L project facilitated linkages with the Lincoln Public Schools and Early Head Start as part Nebraska’s new unified early childhood endorsement program.
  - University of Nebraska-Kearney (UN-K) and Central Community College (two campuses) are planning a program that will link undergraduate programs at the two institutions. UN-K is also developing interdisciplinary graduate coursework.
  - Faculty members at Chadron State College and Western Nebraska Community College worked to support shifts to a unified early childhood endorsement program.

Lessons Learned

- Collaboration is easier when all the partners have a shared context. Nebraska illustrated this lesson in two very different ways.
  - Team members returned from the SCRIPT institute to plan the two-day workshop with additional state partners who had not gone to the institute. The lack of a shared understanding of a “family symbol” activity or other instructional formats made planning more difficult. It also created a sense of inequity in what different partners brought to the planning table.
  - Conversely, it was the participation of diverse partners (family, faculty, practitioner and agency) that made funding for Nebraska’s SCRIPT grants possible. With all the key players at the institute, the team was able to leave with a plan for who needed to do what and where the money could come from.

- There are clear benefits to an extended period of follow-up. Project liaisons and project staff worked together to design the RFP, review proposals and design supports that included the shift, in the most recent funding cycle, to community-specific technical assistance grants.
Systems Level Changes in North Carolina

- Members of the North Carolina SCRIPT team, project staff and state agency partners (Part C, 619, mental health) designed, implemented and evaluated three Family-Faculty Institutes (1999-2001). The targeted outcome from the institutes was an increase in the number of family members, individuals with disabilities, service providers and faculty who work collaboratively on the design, delivery and evaluation of preservice and inservice efforts in North Carolina. A team-based application process was designed, applications for family-interdisciplinary faculty-practitioner teams solicited and 13 teams selected. Follow-up evaluations documented increased collaboration among faculty members, family members and practitioners, increased family involvement in preservice education, hiring of family members in fully-funded positions and increased interdisciplinary coursework and practice.

- In 1999, at the request of SCRIPT team members, two state agencies (Part C, 619) began allocating funds to support family co-instructors in Birth-Kindergarten courses. Funds for this program continue to be made available to North Carolina faculty and are administered by Exceptional Children’s Assistance Center, the PTI for North Carolina.

Lessons Learned

- Parent organizations can play many valuable roles in personnel preparation. One member of the North Carolina SCRIPT team was the director of the state Parent Training and Information (PTI) program (Exceptional Children's Assistance Center or ECAC). Based on her participation and support, ECAC serves as the fiscal agent for several new state initiatives (the Family-Faculty Institutes and the funds to support family co-instructors, described above). ECAC also coordinated all the logistics for the Family-Faculty Institutes and linked many of the participating teams with family members in their communities.

Systems Level Changes in Oklahoma

- A number of preservice enhancements were accomplished.
  - Team members at East Central University developed a two-credit hour seminar for undergraduate students from five disciplines on interdisciplinary teaming that was co-taught by a faculty member and a family member.
  - Team members from three disciplines at the University of Central Oklahoma worked toward implementing interdisciplinary co-instruction.
  - Team members from the Oklahoma University Health Sciences Center developed a brief booklet *(Interdisciplinary Faculty Teams: A Faculty Guide for Getting Started)* about interdisciplinary teamwork.
  - A team member at Western Oklahoma State College increased the number of parents who participate in coursework.

- Mini-grants, supported by Part C, were provided to faculty at participating institutions of higher education. These grants were designed to support improvements related to interdisciplinary preparation and family involvement.

Lessons Learned

- Money, in and of itself, is not enough of an incentive for change. Oklahoma offered mini-grants to faculty in participating institutions of higher education. Interest in receiving the funds was high; however, success in implementing the improvements was limited.

- Fresh partners can be a very good thing. The Oklahoma team included the same members as the previous Midwest Faculty Institute team (a previously funded federal project). In retrospect, the Oklahoma liaisons have indicated that they should have brought more new players to stimulate thinking and challenge convention.

- While participants described rapid and dramatic changes in their teaching as a result of participation (on an individual level), collaborative changes were few and minimal. The only enduring change of those listed above, despite consistent support from state liaisons, is the course at East Central University, which has been expanded to a full semester and has been institutionalized.
Systems Level Changes in North Dakota

- Institutions of higher education increased the emphasis on family involvement in coursework and practical experiences in several communities throughout the state.
- Minot State University team members implemented a 10-hour family practicum experience for students, tied to coursework on family systems and family dynamics. Faculty members engaged family partners as co-instructors.
- University of Mary team members organized, implemented and evaluated a family mentor experience for nursing, occupational therapy, physical therapy and social work students. A major organizer of the experience was a parent who recruited participating families, coordinated visits and provided feedback on the journals of participating students. An article describing the success of this experience has been accepted for publication.

- Increased emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration for faculty and students was most apparent at the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks (UND), where team members organized, implemented and evaluated a course entitled "Transdisciplinary Family-Centered Collaboration in Early Intervention" in 1999. Faculty and students representing occupational therapy, pediatrics/medical genetics, communication sciences and disorders, social work, physical therapy, family and community nursing and teaching and learning are involved in the course. Its purpose was to create a process-oriented, family-centered, competency-based sequence of learning opportunities using a case study approach. Co-teaching and co-learning with family members in home and community settings were integral components of the design. NOTE: This course has been institutionalized at UND and eight disciplines are now involved in planning and implementation.

- SCRIPT team members contributed to the development, delivery and evaluation of two statewide efforts to share ideas for effective personnel preparation. The first was a two-day institute held October 14-15, 1999, in Medora; the second was the North Dakota Birth to Five Early Childhood Institute held June 13-17, 2000, in Grand Forks. Both conferences provided opportunities for faculty, family members, practitioners and state agency representatives to learn and evolve together. Generous support from the North Dakota Department of Human Services and Department of Public Instruction, in the forms of time and resources, made both efforts possible.

Lessons Learned

- North Dakota provides another illustration of the importance of organizing teams in clusters. While one of the clusters had great difficulty making changes, the other three were moderately to very successful. The structure allowed local partners to make progress regardless of what was going on in other parts of the state.

- A change in leadership can be a good thing. Upon returning from the SCRIPT institute, the Part C coordinator, a team member whose support was essential to the team, retired. Initial concerns about the replacement were soon alleviated and the replacement was even more enthusiastic and supportive than the original team member.

- Replication is hard. The North Dakota team had hoped to engage additional clusters and provide an experience like the SCRIPT institute. While they organized a high quality event, they were disappointed at the number of teams they were able to attract to it. Debriefing revealed how much time and effort it takes to "groom" new teams to participate in an intensive learning experience.
Products

Electronic Products

In June, 1998, two listservs were created to facilitate networking with SCRIPT participants. SIFTON is a generic listserv through which methods, materials and opportunities are shared with all project participants. SIFTFAM targets specifically communication with family members. The listservs have been effective tools for sharing information about resources and positions.

In March, 1999, SCRIPT and related systems change projects launched a web site. Housed at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, the web site <www.fpg.unc.edu/~scpp> provides information about SCRIPT methods and findings, down-loadable samples of all SCRIPT measures and free copies of all SCRIPT products, including the Resource Guide. Based on the most recent statistics, the Systems Change in Personnel Preparation web site receives over 1,000 visits each month.

Print Products


Dissemination Activities

Publications

As a result of the work accomplished through SCRIPT and other systems change efforts, the principal investigators were invited to write a recurring column in the journal Young Exceptional Children. The "Resources within Reason" column (see below) features high-quality, low-cost resources for broad early childhood and early intervention audiences.

1996


1997


1998


1999


community-based teamwork & collaboration. *Young Exceptional Children, 2*(4), 27.

Catlett, C., & Winton, P. (1999). Resources within reason: Materials that support teams in
providing effective services. *Young Exceptional Children, 2*(3), 27.


lifelong personnel development: A review of the literature.* Early Childhood Research
Institute on Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS), University of
Illinois: Champaign-Urbana, IL.

S. Sandall & M. Ostrosky (Eds.), *Practical ideas for addressing challenging behaviors.*
Monograph Series. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.


Current facts and challenges.* Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham Child Development
Center.

Winton, P. & Catlett, C. (1999). *What we have learned about preparing personnel to serve
children & families in early childhood intervention.* Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham
Child Development Center.

**2000**

Catlett, C., & Winton, P.J. (2000). Resources within reason: Resources supporting
emerging literacy skills. *Young Exceptional Children, 4*(1), 28.

culturally diversity children and families. *Young Exceptional Children, 3*(4), 27.

support culturally and linguistically diverse families. *Young Exceptional Children, 3*(3),
28.

Catlett, C., & Winton, P. (2000). Resources within reason: Materials that support families
as leaders in collaborative efforts. *Young Exceptional Children, 3*(2), 28.

childhood/early intervention training materials.* Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham


for Occupational Therapy Assistants* (pp. 11-22). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

**Presentations**

One measure of the scope of work accomplished in the four years of this project is the
over 145 presentations made by the Principal Investigators. It is also noteworthy that many
of the presentations were made in conjunction with state events coordinated by SCRIPT
team members.

**1996**

and materials to support teaching and learning in early intervention. One-day faculty
training workshop, PARTNERSHIPS: Training for Early Intervention Services,
Champaign, IL.

that promote active learning. Innovations in Early Intervention Conference, Cromwell,
CT.

Poster presentation, International DEC Conference, Phoenix, AZ.

1997


1998

Winton, P. (1998, April). What is the National Center for Early Development and Learning and how might it help the community college system? Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Community College Early Educators. Asheville, NC.
Catlett, C., & Mandeville, J. (1998, July). More than two can tango: Methods and materials to prepare students for interdisciplinary teamwork. Faculty institute in Early Intervention, Columbia, SC.


Catlett, C. (1998, August). How can we develop the capacity of personnel to provide inclusive child care? Maps to Inclusive Child Care Institute, Bethesda, MD.


preparation of personnel to work with young children with disabilities and their families. European Early Childhood Educational Research Association (EECERA), Helsinki, Finland.


Catlett, C., & Balsdon, D. (1999, October). Methods and materials for teaching about culture and diversity. North Dakota SCRIPT Faculty Institute, Medora, ND.

Catlett, C. (1999, October). Spice it up: Methods & materials that support active learning. North Dakota SCRIPT Faculty Institute, Medora, ND.


Winton, P. (1999, October). The role of public schools in early education. SERVE Forum on School Improvement, Atlanta, GA.


Catlett, C. (1999, November). Designing interactions that support developing brains. Early Years: Critical Years for Idaho’s Children, Boise, ID.


Catlett, C., & Roszmann-Millican, M. (2000, February). You hold the nail, I'll hold the hammer: Resources for building trust, collaboration, and teamwork. Partnerships for change: Reframing the picture, Jamestown, KY.


Catlett, C., & Moore, B. (2000, February). New frames for familiar pictures: Methods and materials for teaching about and modelling family-professional collaboration. Partnerships for change: Reframing the picture, Jamestown, KY.

Catlett, C., & Kirk, Tennant. (2000, February). We're different, we're the same: Reframing how we think about culture & diversity. Partnerships for change: Reframing the picture, Jamestown, KY.

Catlett, C. (2000, February). Framing the future: Team visions and next steps. Partnerships for change: Reframing the picture, Jamestown, KY.


Catlett, C. (2000, March). Intersecting interests: Weaving new information and new strategies into daily interactions with young children and families. 2-day short course for the Western Maryland Early Intervention Training Consortium, Cumberland, MD.


Catlett, C. (2000, April). We're different, we're the same: Reframing how we address culture and diversity in preservice education. Iowa Invitational Symposium on Higher Education, Cedar Rapids, IA.


Catlett, C. (2000, April). Early brain development: resources to support everyday practice. Oklahoma Higher Education Consortium for Early Intervention Faculty Institute, Oklahoma City, OK.


Williams, E.S., & Catlett, C. (2000, June). Methods and materials for preparing students to work with diverse children and families. Family-Faculty Institute, Greensboro, NC.


Other Indicators of Project's Effect on the Field of Early Intervention and/or Children with Disabilities and their Families

- **SCRIPT** distributed over 2,000 copies of the *Resource*. Camera-ready, single-sided originals were shared with ten states (OH, IN, ND, NE, IA, NC, MO, IL, VA, WV) for further dissemination.

- Six **SCRIPT** states (IA, KY, MO, NE, NC, ND) replicated the interactive format for connecting individuals involved in early intervention personnel preparation with high-quality, low-cost training materials, developed for the **SCRIPT** institutes.

- West Virginia replicated the entire **SCRIPT** process (stakeholder group, state priorities, regional teams, institute, follow-up) with a slightly different emphasis. With free consultation from **SCRIPT** staff, the IMPACT 2000 initiative has prioritized increasing the emphasis on disability issues in all preservice education. Additional information is available at [http://www.uacdd.wvu.edu/impact/](http://www.uacdd.wvu.edu/impact/).

- The Southeastern Education Development Laboratory (SEDL) replicated **SCRIPT** formats for a recent product and conference. *Resource Guide for Planning and Operating After-School Programs* was modeled directly on the *Resource Guide*, and the "petting zoo" approach was used to provide SEDL participants with an overview of resources in six interrelated areas.

- Team members from four states (Oklahoma, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri) extended the priority for preservice change and improvement to the regional level. Working with partners from neighboring Kansas, and supported by **SCRIPT** staff, they planned and implemented the Midwest Faculty Institute on November 2-3, 2000. The institute drew 150+ participants (community college and university faculty, Head Start, family members, state agency personnel, observers from other states) to sessions highlighting new methods, models and materials. One faculty participant described the conference as "the best adult learning event [she'd] ever been to." In fact, Kansas state agency representatives and faculty members who participated in the Midwest Faculty Institute have successfully lobbied for support from the Kansas State Improvement Grant (SIG) to implement the **SCRIPT** model in Kansas.

- Based on our wish to share information about **SCRIPT** as widely as possible, Part C coordinators, 619 coordinators and ICC chairs from all states and jurisdictions have routinely been targeted for dissemination of project materials.

Implications of Findings: Lessons Learned and Promising Strategies

What follows is a summary of some of the valuable lessons learned about early childhood/early intervention personnel preparation, at both individual and systems levels.

**Faculty Are Willing and Interested to Participate in Efforts that Improve their Effectiveness**

At the beginning of this project, there was some anxiety about the level of interest that faculty might have for the activities of this project. Tenure and promotion are usually tied to preservice teaching, research and publication. The extent to which faculty would be supported by deans and administrators was another uncertainty with research suggesting that support might be lacking (Gallagher & Staples, 1990). The question of where and how
to secure travel money to support faculty participation in the SCRIPT project was also a
concern. The rate of participation in this project makes it clear now that faculty are willing
to commit time and energy to efforts that improve the quality of their own teaching/training.
Furthermore, they are willing to work with colleagues on a statewide basis to improve the
quality of preparation of the future workforce. It is significant that deans and university
administrators were supportive of faculty involvement. They might not be willing to sponsor
or plan staff development activities for faculty; however, if someone else does the
planning, they are willing to play a supporting role.

One of the barriers identified by faculty to accomplishing their early intervention
training goals was competing priorities for their time. Collaboration across disciplines, with
families, and with state agencies takes time and energy; bureaucratic red tape at the state
agency and university levels created frustration. Strategies identified by faculty for
rewarding and reinforcing their participation included reimbursement to “buy out” their time
from existing university responsibilities, and bureaucratic support at the university and
state levels for some of the collaborative and innovative approaches to training they
wanted to implement.

Collegial Support is Important

Needs assessment data indicated that access to faculty with whom to co-teach was
highly rated as a resource that would help faculty. In addition, when asked during the
follow-up interviews what contributed to their success in achieving their individual goals, a
consistent response was the support of colleagues. This suggests that providing
networking opportunities in conjunction with structured instructional sessions is an effective
strategy for supporting faculty. Faculty also said that having some kind of means for
continuing to sustain these relationships, which sometimes entailed distances across
states, were helpful. Higher education consortia or personnel preparation sub-committees
of the state interagency coordinating council (ICC) were strategies that were potentially
helpful, although faculty indicated that these structures can be unrewarding if they lack
clearly stated, meaningful and obtainable goals. A mechanism that has worked well in
some states is organizing the SCRIPT team in clusters (i.e., small groups of participants,
including families, service providers, state agency representatives, and faculty, whose
geographic proximity facilitates collaborative work). Nebraska and North Dakota are
examples where “clustering” has provided participants with a concrete opportunity to
implement training ideas and relationships developed through SCRIPT.

Faculty Want Access to Instructional Resources

Access to training resources was also identified by participants through the needs
assessment process as a critical resource that would assist them. After participating in the
four-day faculty institute, several states pursued strategies for developing or updating
training resource libraries in their states. Some states used Part C money or blended
money from several state agencies to purchase materials discovered through SCRIPT and
to set up or update state-wide or regionally based lending libraries. Other states
discovered that some of the materials were available in their states but access had been
limited because of lack of information about the materials. States realized that resource
guides describing existing materials were important in promoting access.

Emphasis and Appreciation for the Importance of Innovative Training Strategies
Increased

Another finding from the faculty needs assessment was that faculty were more
confident in their knowledge and skills related to early intervention content than they were
of their knowledge and skills related to training strategies. Most participants left the
SCRIPT faculty institute with an increased appreciation for the important role that adult
learning principles and interactive training strategies have in successfully conveying and
teaching early intervention content and skills to practitioners and students. Comparison of
pre-institute/six-month post-institute data indicated that participants increased their use of
interactive, innovative instructional strategies. A related outcome is that some states are
beginning to share information about training strategies and build skills with a broader audience in their own states. Several states have planned and implemented workshops or institutes, modeled after the SCRIPT faculty institute, independently, or as part of larger conferences for faculty and state agency personnel across disciplines and agencies. Training strategies that have been used in these events include the following:

- "boss/dean" letters to effectively engage university support for faculty participation
- "back home plans" to encourage immediate application of ideas to practice
- resource libraries to provide faculty with immediate access to exemplary training materials
- instructional sessions that demonstrate innovative training strategies.

Outcomes Evolved

There were many unique outcomes that developed as a result of this project and the relationships that were made among team members. Some of these outcomes were not part of the planning process done at the four-day institute, but evolved over time. For example, conversations about the possibility of state agency support for increasing family involvement and interdisciplinary learning in preservice education at the SCRIPT institute evolved into a Request for Proposals (RFP) and multi-year sequence of grants, training and technical assistance in Nebraska. Another strong example of a significant outcome that evolved over time was the Midwest Faculty Institute (see fifth bullet on page 31 for a description). While initial planning began during the no-cost extension period of SCRIPT, the actual institutes (2000 and 2001) were designed and implemented after the project period ended. These are only two examples of the unexpected outcomes that were the result of the SCRIPT project.

Systems Change Requires Time

The emphasis on linking higher education and state agency efforts clearly had benefits. Faculty came to the training with some specific ideas about ways they might apply what they learned within a broader state plan. They also came knowing that their involvement was supported by university and state administrators, and that there was some expectation that they would serve as a training resource for the state agencies within their state. Carolina Policy Studies Project research has indicated that states that have made the most progress in implementing the personnel preparation components of Part C are those with strong linkages between state agencies and institutions of higher education. The priority for creating this sense of a "shared commitment" between university faculty and state agencies was an important component of the SIFT model, the model on which the SCRIPT project was based. Pre-institute/six-month post-institute differences indicated that preservice-inservice linkages have occurred as a result of SCRIPT. At the same time, we continue to document that longer follow-up is necessary to support and monitor attempts to redesign personnel preparation systems to meet quality standards. For example, the Iowa training to support family members in instructional roles (FEEL) mentioned above would have gone unreported without a significant period of follow-up (18+ months). Another related finding is the importance of the follow-up provided by the SCRIPT project. A large percentage of faculty cited this as being a facilitator to their being able to accomplish their goals.

Strong Partners are Essential

In previous systems change work, and again in SCRIPT, we have seen how important it is to have capable a strong state partner (liaison) with whom to collaborate. Few states have been able to make the model of shared leadership work (more than one liaison). Working with a liaison whose paid state job is to promote improvements in personnel development systems is also helpful. Such an individual will view supporting the ongoing work of the SCRIPT team as part of their job, rather than an additional voluntary assignment.
Evaluation is Critical

For a long time personnel preparation has been a "backburner" Part C issue in states. States struggled with more pressing components of the legislation such as determining eligibility, developing child find strategies and dealing with service coordination, delivery and funding issues. Now that all states have reached the implementation phase of Part C, attention is being turned to personnel issues. Policymakers at state and federal levels are asking questions about the efficacy of current personnel efforts. They are wondering why universities have not successfully solved the shortage problems and why turnover rates remain high. They want data supporting the effectiveness of plans developed in support of the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). Too often the "train and hope" mentality has prevailed: evaluation efforts have focused on superficial outcomes, such as number of participants, number of events held, and general satisfaction levels of participants. Questions such as, "Did the training result in documented and positive changes in skill and knowledge levels of participants", "Did the participants apply what they learned in their practice settings?", or "Did positive changes in program policies and practices result from the training efforts" are rarely asked. A related issue is that the form of training most often used, the one-shot workshop, is likely to be ineffective as a means for accomplishing these outcomes.

Faculty who participated in the SCRIPT model learned about innovative approaches and models to personnel preparation that involve partnerships across disciplines and with service providers and families. They have been exposed to evaluation strategies that address the outcomes described above. Faculty also have incentives and pressures to conduct research and disseminate findings; this is a primary means for obtaining promotions and respect from academic colleagues. These are strengths that university faculty bring to personnel preparation evaluation efforts. State agencies have training monies and responsibilities; they also have interest and expertise in evaluation research but often lack the manpower resources to implement effective evaluations. Working together can serve both groups. The ultimate beneficiaries of the quality personnel preparation efforts that will result from this partnership are the practitioners and the young children and families they serve.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Several future activities that build on SCRIPT are planned or underway. The principal investigators have secured two additional Department of Education awards to pursue research and training that build directly on SCRIPT.

• A Project of National Significance entitled New Scripts for 21st Century Services: An Innovative Model for Supporting Change and Reform in Interprofessional Preservice Training is extending the systems change model to emphasize community college participation and cultural/linguistic diversity in nine states (CO, DE, KY, MO, NM, OH, SC, TX, WV). New Scripts has collaborated with the National Research Center for Early Childhood Development and Learning (NCEDL) to extend opportunities in the project for collaboration between early childhood faculty and early intervention faculty.

• Walking the Walk: Promoting Diversity in Early Childhood Intervention through Campus-Community Partnerships is a U.S. Department of Education Outreach grant that is applying the SCRIPT model to increasing the cultural and linguistic diversity of leadership and personnel serving young children and families. Six North Carolina communities are participating in a sequence of training and technical assistance designed to support improvements in recruitment, preparation, supports and linkages related to diversity.

• Natural Allies: Working with Community Colleges to Prepare Personnel to Provide Quality Services for All Young Children in Natural Environments is a new Special Project that has benefited tremendously from the lessons learned through SCRIPT.
This project will work with community college faculty, family members, practitioners and state agency representatives in eight states on infusing exceptionality in early childhood coursework and practica.
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