

WORK GROUP MEMBERS

Rebecca Votaw

Region IX Disabilities/MH Specialist

Michael Zito

Coordinator, Head Start – State
Collaboration Office
CDE/Child Development Division

Linda Brault

Director, MAP to Inclusive Child Care
WestEd Center for Child & Family
Studies

Darlene Burton

Program Services Administrator /
Disabilities Specialist
Center for Community & Family
Services, Inc

Meredith Cathcart

Special Education Consultant
CDE/Special Education Division

Edward Condon

Executive Director
CA Head Start Association

Erin Dubey

Consultant
First 5 California

Sarah Finnegan

Early Intervention Director
Regional Center of the East Bay

Anne Kuschner

Director, Desired Results Access
Napa County Office of Education

Debra Merchant

Early Childhood Education Manager
San Juan Unified School District

Beverley Morgan-Sandoz

Los Angeles County Office of
Education, Member State Interagency
Coordinating Council on Early
Intervention

Pamela Quiroz

Special Education Consultant
CDE/Special Education Division

Gaye Riggs

Assistant Superintendent
Early Care and Education
Merced County Office of Education

Anne Schultze

Disabilities Manager
Yolo County Supt of Schools

Sue Story

Head Start Director
Child, Family & Community Services,
Inc

Joan Sufliata

Disabilities Coordinator
Unity Council Early Head Start

Patric Widmann

Staff Manager, Early Start Program
Department of Developmental Services

May 19, 2008



California Department of
EDUCATION

To: Leaders in Head Start and Early Childhood Special Education From: The Head Start Collaborative Inclusion Work Group

The enclosed survey was developed through a collaborative effort of members of the Head Start Inclusion Work Group, representing the following agencies: the Region IX Head Start TA Network, the California Department of Education (Head Start Collaboration Office and Special Education Division), the California Head Start Association, the Department of Developmental Services, First 5 California, and representatives of both programs and technical assistance projects. The survey was developed out of a need to identify a statewide perspective on California's efforts to support young children with disabilities in early childhood education inclusive programs. By completing this survey you are helping to establish a set of recommendations and priorities for effective professional development and to help target necessary resources for teachers and children.

This survey is intended to identify the degree to which policies and practices are in place and implemented that support the inclusion of young children with individualized education plans (IEPs) in Head Start Programs. We are interested in getting the perspective of both Head Start Program staff members and early childhood special educators providing services to children with IEPs enrolled in Head Start.

The information from this survey will be used to recommend professional development activities to support the inclusion of children with IEPs in Head Start programs and to contribute to sustainable quality practices that benefit all young children.

Your response to the survey is critical to the success of this effort. Please take the time to print the survey and distribute it to the people in your program most qualified to accurately respond to the questions in this survey (see page 2 for suggestions). Once the information is compiled, completion of the online survey should take no more than 20 minutes.

Thank you for your leadership!

Head Start Collaborative Inclusion Survey

Instructions

Who should respond? Two groups should respond to this survey:

- Head Start Programs or Agencies – defined as groups of classrooms supported by a set of administrative personnel.
- Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Programs or Agencies – defined as programs or services offered by a Local Education Agency (LEA) serving children with IEPs in Head Start Programs and other typical environments for preschool children.

Ideally, the survey would be completed jointly by groups of individuals within each of these agencies (the larger organization) and would include input from teachers, administrators, families, and other key people in the programs (the service level).

How to complete the survey:

One person within your organization should be identified as the **primary person** responsible for gathering the information from individuals within the program and for submitting the completed survey by the deadline.

This survey has been designed by identifying areas of educational practice that contribute to positive outcomes of inclusive programs (e.g. *Curriculum and Shared Child Activities*). One **primary person** should identify the person or group of persons within each program who can most accurately respond to each area of educational practice. For example, Head Start may want to give the *Curriculum and Shared Child Activities* area to a disability services coordinator or other staff person that participates in the adaptation of curriculum for children with disabilities across several classrooms. The ECSE agency may give this same area to an itinerant inclusion teacher or co-teacher. The *Administrative Level* area might be given to the person in the organization who manages written policies and allocates resources to classroom teachers or staff. If more than one person completes an area, the individuals should work to reach a level of agreement on the rating for the section.

How to return the survey:

Please complete and return the survey by July 30. Once the survey is completed, we recommend that the primary person compile the information and electronically transfer the completed survey from the paper version to the following website:

<http://tinyurl.com/6z29lg>

or

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ghnpmRf30NZ8V1hWm3aaw_3d_3d

Keep in mind that *Survey Monkey* (the survey program) will not allow you to save your responses and complete the data entry at a later time, so please schedule enough time to enter responses to ALL of the items at once.

If electronic submission is difficult, you can mail the paper version of the survey to:

**California Map to Inclusive Child Care
751 Rancheros Drive
Suite 2
San Marcos, CA 92069**

If you have any questions about this survey, its use, or how the data will be compiled, safeguarded, analyzed, or reported, please contact Linda Brault <lbrault@wested.org>

Content Development and Use of the Instrument

Purpose: The purpose of this survey is to identify the extent to which policies and practices that support young children with disabilities (children with IEPs, ages three through five years) in inclusive environments are in place between Head Start Programs/Agencies and Preschool Special Education local education areas (LEAs).

Outcome: The outcome of this survey will be a set of recommendations for activities that will support an increase in the numbers of children with IEPs who are successfully enrolled and participating in California's Head Start Programs.

Content: A list of areas important to supporting inclusion in Head Start programs was developed based on extant literature and the survey responses by Head Start administrators (conducted by the California Head Start Collaborative in the Fall of 2007).

Areas	Definition of Area
I Shared Values/Beliefs	Administrators, families, teachers, and children share a belief in inclusion as a desirable outcome and best practice.
II Interagency Collaboration	All agencies involved collaborate. Agencies have Interagency Agreements (IAs) or Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that are jointly developed and regularly reviewed among participating agencies.
III Administrative Level	Administrators and managers provide written policy and adequate resources to support inclusion of children with disabilities in early childhood settings.
IV Curriculum and Shared Child Activities	Classrooms use a curriculum that can be modified to include children with disabilities. Children with IEPs participate in shared activities with their typically developing peers.
V Family Involvement	Families are involved in all aspects of the program. Families are fully informed about their rights and have enough information to make decisions.
VI Continuous Program Evaluation	Agencies and programs are continuously monitoring the effectiveness of their practices, child progress, and the implementation of policies.
Collaboration and Teaming*	Service providers collaborate in the planning and implementation of services for all children. Roles and responsibilities are clearly communicated.

* There are a set of questions at the end of sections III, IV, & VI to measure aspects of collaboration and teaming as they relate to these specific areas.

Survey format: Items have been designed to measure each area of practice. Each item is scored on a scale from 1 – 6. For each item, a rating of 1 will be defined as “not in place,” a rating of 3 or 4 will be defined as “in place but not implemented” and a rating of 6 will be defined as “in place and fully implemented.”

Selecting a rating: The following table provides guidance on how to respond to items on the survey. It is critical that all individuals responding to the survey have access to this guidance to ensure consistency in ratings across personnel.

Rating		Definition	<i>Example behaviors for rating page 10, item 40: “The curriculum is modified to accommodate children with IEPs as needed”</i>
Not in place	1	There is no awareness of the issue	Staff members are not aware that a curriculum may need to be modified or differentiated/ individualized.
	2	There is awareness in the group that this is an issue but there are no policies or practices in place to address it.	The staff are aware that curriculum should be modified but do not know how to make modifications or provide differentiated/ individualized instruction.
In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented	3	There is a policy or procedure in place but it is not implemented	Curricular modifications are not based on individual child needs, e.g. Teachers have been instructed to add pegs to puzzle pieces regardless of the disabilities represented in their classroom.
	4	There is an appropriate policy or procedure in place but it is inconsistently implemented	Teachers have been instructed to modify the curriculum based on the needs of individual children and implementation of this practice is not consistent across all classrooms in the program.
In place and fully implemented	5	There is appropriate policy or practice in place and implemented across most classrooms.	Teachers have been instructed to modify the curriculum based on the needs of individual children and most teachers are able to appropriately modify activities and individualize/ differentiate instruction for most children
	6	There is appropriate policy or procedure in place and implemented for all. Implementation is modified based on needs and effectiveness.	Curriculum modifications and differentiated/individualized instruction are implemented and evidenced in all classrooms. Changes to instruction and curriculum occur based on ongoing assessment and observation of child behaviors and outcomes

Basic Information About Respondents

In order to best understand the responses provided on the survey, please provide the following information about the agency or program and those completing the survey. This will only be used to assist the data analysis. There will be no individual identifying information linked to the survey. By proceeding with the survey, you consent to the use of the data provided. You may decline or withdraw participation at any time with no penalty.

Agency or Program

Select the Agency or Program description that best fits your agency or program

Head Start Agency	
<input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Grantee <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Program: School District or County Office operated <input type="checkbox"/> Migrant Head Start <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Delegate Agency <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Program: Community Agency Operated <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Head Start
Early Childhood Special Education LEA	
<input type="checkbox"/> SELPA <input type="checkbox"/> Cluster of programs or schools within a School District <input type="checkbox"/> County Office of Education	<input type="checkbox"/> School District <input type="checkbox"/> Individual school or program within a School District <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please list)

Location, Size, and Type

Select the categories that best describe the location, size, and type of your agency or program.

Location		
<input type="checkbox"/> Northern California <input type="checkbox"/> Central California	<input type="checkbox"/> Southern California <input type="checkbox"/> State-wide	
Size		
<input type="checkbox"/> Small	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input type="checkbox"/> Large
Type		
<input type="checkbox"/> Rural	<input type="checkbox"/> Suburban	<input type="checkbox"/> Urban

Job Category

Select the categories that best describe the job category of the individuals who completed the survey in your agency or program.

Head Start Agency	
<input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Administrator <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Classroom Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Disability Manager <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Disability Specialist
Head Start Site or Program	
<input type="checkbox"/> Director/Site Supervisor <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Classroom Teacher <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Teaching Assistant <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Inclusion Support Staff <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start/EHS Home Visitor <input type="checkbox"/> Head Start Family Member
Early Childhood Special Education LEA	
<input type="checkbox"/> Program Specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Early Childhood Special Education Director <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education Teacher, Co-teacher <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education Teacher, Itinerant teacher <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Assistant <input type="checkbox"/> Family Member of a child with an IEP	<input type="checkbox"/> Speech, Language, Hearing Specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Occupational Therapist <input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Physical Education teacher <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education Teacher for Deaf <input type="checkbox"/> Special Education Teacher for Visually Impaired <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please list)

I Shared Values/Beliefs

Definition: Administrators, families, teachers, and children share a belief in inclusion as a desirable outcome and best practice

Circle the rating that best describes the degree of implementation in your program.

Statement	Not in place		In place but not fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
1. A clearly written philosophy is in place that articulates the benefits of inclusion for all children and families and communicates a message that “all children are welcomed	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Broadly held agreements regarding values and goals underlying inclusion efforts are communicated across agencies and among all staff and families.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Adult working relationships are reported to be highly positive and rewarding.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. A high degree of cooperation, collaboration, and mutual respect among staff is evidenced by verbal and written communication, teaching practices, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. A written philosophy states the program or agency’s goals, objectives, and definition of inclusion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The philosophy supports the program or agency’s commitment to family involvement and this value is reflected across all participating agencies.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The program or agency’s philosophy regarding inclusive practice is developed and supported by all staff.	1	2	3	4	5	6

II Interagency Collaboration

Definition: All agencies involved collaborate. Agencies have Interagency Agreements (IAs) or Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that are jointly developed and regularly reviewed among participating agencies.

Circle the rating that best describes the degree of implementation in your agency.

Statement	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
8. There is an interagency agreement in place and updated regularly.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The interagency agreement provides avenues for resolution of conflicts as they arise.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Communication between agencies is respectful (e.g., agencies are notified when there is a change in personnel; agencies and individuals are routinely recognized for their contributions).	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Communication between agencies is timely (e.g. phone calls are returned; email etiquette is followed; agencies strive to develop shared forms and information for families such as a family brochure on including children in Head Start programs).	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. LEAs and Head Start have agreed upon identification, referral, assessment, and Individualized Education Plan (IEP) processes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Agreed upon timelines are met by all agencies (e.g., referrals, transition information, meeting reviews).	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Meetings are attended by all vested parties and seen as part of roles and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. There is an agreed upon protocol for LEA use of the screening and assessment information from Head Start (e.g., mutually agreed upon tools, methods of sharing information).	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. There is an agreed upon protocol for Head Start understanding and use of the diagnostic and evaluation information from LEAs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Agencies ensure that copies of relevant forms and information are shared with parent consent (e.g. Head Start providers get a copy of all	1	2	3	4	5	6

Statement	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented		
documents relevant to the IEP).				18. All agencies have a clear understanding of the requirements under Head Start.	1 2	3 4	5 6
19. All agencies have a clear understanding of the requirements under IDEA Part B 619 (Preschool).	1 2	3 4	5 6	20. Administrators keep one another informed about updates in legislation for special education and Head Start.	1 2	3 4	5 6
21. Administrators are knowledgeable about relevant legislation (ADA, IDEA, Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act, Head Start Performance Standards) and requirements for sites and settings.	1 2	3 4	5 6	22. Staff members working directly with children and families have been trained and are aware of relevant legislation (ADA, IDEA, Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act, Head Start Performance Standards) and requirements for sites and settings.	1 2	3 4	5 6

IIIa Administrative Level

Definition: Administrators and managers provide written policy and adequate resources to support inclusion of children with disabilities in early childhood settings.

Circle the rating that best describes the degree of implementation in your program.

Statement	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Inclusion issues and policies are identified and addressed among collaborating agencies (e.g., during regularly scheduled interagency meetings). These <i>may</i> include creating and monitoring fiscal policies, personnel standards, eligibility, professional development needs, and transportation policies.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Current MOUs or IAs regarding inclusive practice are in place among all collaborating agencies and meet requirements of each participating agency.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. There is collaboration among key agencies to implement flexible fiscal and administrative procedures that support inclusion within the early childhood settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Key agencies collaborate to provide professional development opportunities for families, all staff, and administrators to develop and work within inclusive settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Agencies work together to increase inclusive enrollment opportunities in early childhood settings for children with more significant disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Participating agencies emphasize the importance of designing inclusive programs to accommodate individual learning characteristics of children.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. Programmatic agreements, clear problem-solving strategies, and negotiation of difficulties are in place and practiced.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Participating agencies work together to delineate roles, responsibilities, and timelines to support inclusion in early childhood education programs (e.g., agencies agree to procedures and timelines to expedite appropriate referrals and assessments).	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Participating agencies are informed and work to	1	2	3	4	5	6

Statement	Not in place	In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented	In place and fully implemented
address resistance to change issues such as: a negative attitude towards inclusion, professional “turf” issues, differing levels of educational background and training, economic equity, disability awareness.			

IIIb Administrative Level: Team Performance

Please respond to the following items based on the performance of teams in the agencies responsible for policy, practices, and implementation of the items above.

Administrative Level Teams*	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
32. Administrative level teams are identified to complete specific tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Administrative level team members are very clear about their roles and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. Administrative level team members coordinate their efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. The administrative level team members participate in a process for making decisions as well as communicating what decisions have been made.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. The administrative level team is accountable to progress toward action plans and goals. They meet to modify goals or action plans as needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. There is representation of family members on the administrative level team.	1	2	3	4	5	6

* Members of the team may vary for different activities. To achieve a 5 or 6 on these items, the team must have participating members from both the Head Start and early childhood special education (ECSE) program. If the team members represent only one agency, the rating should be no higher than a 4.

IVa Curriculum and Shared Child Activities

Definition: Classrooms use a curriculum that can be modified to include children with disabilities. Children with IEPs participate in shared activities with their typically developing peers.

Circle the rating that best describes the degree of implementation in your program.

Statement	Not in place	In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented	In place and fully implemented
38. Classroom staff implements a research-based curriculum (shown to be effective through valid and reliable research).	1 2	3 4	5 6
39. Teachers and program staff have arranged environments, materials, and curriculum in a manner that promotes access and meaningful interaction	1 2	3 4	5 6
40. The curriculum is modified to accommodate children with IEPs as needed.	1 2	3 4	5 6
41. Children with IEPs are routinely and intentionally included in instructional activities, with support and modifications as needed.	1 2	3 4	5 6
42. Classroom staff promotes skill acquisition through developmentally appropriate curriculum modifications and adaptations within daily activities for children with special needs.	1 2	3 4	5 6
43. Classroom staff are active participants in the development of planning for appropriate supports and services needed for an individual child with an IEP.	1 2	3 4	5 6
44. For children receiving services designated on an IEP, the classroom staff and special educators have clear understandings about how those services will be provided and/or coordinated within the general classroom.	1 2	3 4	5 6
45. For children who have been evaluated for special education, but do not meet the eligibility for IEP services, the assessment team provides recommendations for modifications and follow-up that may be needed in the general classroom.	1 2	3 4	5 6
46. There is regular communication between all team members supporting a child with an IEP	1 2	3 4	5 6

Statement	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
(early childhood educators, special educators, related services personnel, family members) and opportunities for regular meetings.						
47. Intervention is embedded in the routines of the classroom. All supports or services provided to a child in a classroom environment are designed based on optimizing the child's sense of belonging to their group of peers and classroom community.	1	2	3	4	5	6

IVb Curriculum and Shared Child Activities: Team Performance

Please respond to the following items based on the performance of teams in the agencies responsible for policy, practices, and implementation **of the items above**.

Teams Providing Curriculum and Shared Child Activities*	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
48. Teams are identified to complete specific tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. Team members are very clear about their roles and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. Team members coordinate their efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
51. Team members participate in a process for making decisions as well as communicating what decisions have been made.	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. The team is accountable to progress toward action plans and goals. They meet to modify goals or action plans as needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. There is representation of family members on the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6

* *Members of the team may vary for different activities. To achieve a 5 or 6 on these items, the team must have participating members from both the Head Start and early childhood special education (ECSE) program. If the team members represent only one agency, the rating should be no higher than a 4.*

V Family Involvement

Definition: Families are involved in all aspects of the program. Families are fully informed about their rights and have enough information to make decisions.

Circle the rating that best describes the degree of implementation in your program.

Statement	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
54. Families are involved at the policy/leadership level.	1	2	3	4	5	6
55. Family input is solicited as part of the overall program planning process and impacts the decisions made.	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. There are multiple strategies for communicating with families about inclusive practice and options for support including written resources, conferences, and parent meetings to ensure that all families are informed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
57. Family members are involved in planning for their individual child in meaningful and proactive ways.	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. Families are encouraged to team with program staff in the development of individualized plans of support for children, including strategies that may be used in the home and community. (There are ongoing meetings.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. Family support opportunities are available when children with IEPs are enrolled in inclusive settings or classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. In Head Start, family support activities and the Policy Council are open and welcoming for family members of children with IEPs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. In LEAs, family support activities and parent leadership opportunities are open and welcoming for family members of children in Head Start.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Vla Continuous Program Evaluation

Definition: Agencies and programs are continuously monitoring the effectiveness of their practices, child progress, and the implementation of policies.

Circle the rating that best describes the degree of implementation in your program.

Statement	Not in place	In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented	In place and fully implemented
62. There is a process for measuring the implementation of inclusion policies and practices.	1 2	3 4	5 6
63. A set of procedures for monitoring child progress on desired outcomes is administered.	1 2	3 4	5 6
64. If children are not making expected progress, steps are taken to modify classroom activities to meet identified needs.	1 2	3 4	5 6
65. A set of procedures to monitor desired family outcomes is administered.	1 2	3 4	5 6
66. Data on desired family outcomes are used to modify program activities to meet identified family needs.	1 2	3 4	5 6
67. A monitoring system is in place to ensure that children with a range of disabilities and instructional needs are served in inclusive settings.	1 2	3 4	5 6
68. A monitoring system is in place to ensure that the requirements of the agency related to the inclusion of children with disabilities in programs is accomplished (e.g., 10% Head Start requirement; least restrictive environment requirements for LEAs).	1 2	3 4	5 6
69. The results of program evaluation are communicated to all community partners, families and other interested parties.	1 2	3 4	5 6

Vlb Continuous Program Evaluation: Team Performance

Please respond to the following items based on the performance of teams in the agencies responsible for policy, practices, and implementation of the items above.

Teams: Agency or Program Staff that Participate in Self-Monitoring and Continuous Program Evaluation Activities*	Not in place		In place but <u>not</u> fully implemented		In place and fully implemented	
70. Teams are identified to complete specific tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. Team members are very clear about their roles and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. Team members coordinate their efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
73. Team members participate in a process for making decisions as well as communicating what decisions have been made.	1	2	3	4	5	6
74. The team is accountable to progress toward action plans and goals. They meet to modify goals or action plans as needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
75. There is representation of family members on the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6

* Members of the team may vary for different activities. To achieve a 5 or 6 on these items, the team must have participating members from both the Head Start and early childhood special education (ECSE) program. If the team members represent only one agency, the rating should be no higher than a 4.