Year 1 Review
Orientation

325T FY2011 Grantees, Cohort V
6/7/12
Purpose of the 325T Year 1 Review

Section (a)1 of the priority requires that...

- The first year of the project period will be used for planning an improved or restructured K-12 teacher preparation program...
- Implementation of the plan may not begin without approval from OSEP.
Purpose of the 325T Year 1 Review - cont.

- The Year 1 Review is unique to 325T Grantees and is designed to provide support and feedback to grantees from peers early in the project’s five-year period.
  - As a cooperative agreement, 325T grantees are engaged in greater levels of accountability and reporting than typical grants.
- The Review does not replace the *Annual Performance Report* which is submitted in April of each project year.
- OSEP project officers provide support and resources to 325T grantees to assist them in achieving project goals and to meet and exceed the requirements published in the 325T priority.
Reporting Requirements
See Year 1 Review Guide

- **Five Domains of Improvement** (Aligned with the Absolute Priority):
  - Licensure /Certification Standards
  - Organizational Structure and Instructional Delivery
  - Curriculum and Course Content
  - Student Support
  - Program Evaluation
Reporting Requirements
See Year 1 Review Guide – cont.

• Also required is the Syllabi Revision Summary Sheet to report progress only (revised syllabi- due May 1, 2013).
• A timeline for the remainder of the project is also needed, which can be adapted from your application.
Year 1 Review Process

- See attached Year 1 Review Timeline
- Submit *Year 1 Review, Five-Year Timeline*, and *Syllabi Revision Summary* sheet to your project officer by 9/28/2012.
- Teleconference reviews will be scheduled beginning the 2nd week in October (tentatively Oct. 9th-31st).
Process – cont.

- **Team Review**
  - 325T Project Director
  - Project Officer
  - 325T Peer Reviewers

- **Reviews** scheduled by the American Institute for Research (AIR)
Process – cont.

- **Teleconference Scheduled (1.5 hours)**
  - PD presents plan by domain (Ppt is suggested)
  - Reviewers ask questions and lead discussion to
    - Seek further clarification
    - Explore gaps in plan or presentation
    - Identify areas in need of further work

- Feedback from summarized by AIR
Reviewer Ratings

Peer Reviewers rate each grantee’s progress and provide comments on an individual review form:

- **Met requirements**: Sufficient information and documentation was provided for the reviewer to decide that the grantee has met requirements for project activities.

- **In progress, but not complete**: Sufficient information and documentation was provided for the reviewer to decide that the grantee has described project activities and is progressing toward meeting requirements.

- **More information is needed**: The grantee omitted information, and documentation was not provided for the reviewer to decide that the grantee has met or is progressing toward meeting requirements.
Process – cont.

- After the reviewer and PO finalize each report, it is sent to the PD and a 30 minutes teleconference is scheduled.
- All reports are synthesized to describe findings across projects.
- PD, POs, and reviewers will complete an evaluation at the conclusion of the review.
Operationalize the Framework

- Report explicit activities.
- Describe program improvement efforts (or plans for action) under each domain.
- Provide supporting documents as appropriate.
Suggestions

- Align with your Cooperative Agreement and Annual Performance Report
-Suggestions to address the criteria within the domains:
  A. Licensure Standards
  - Focus attention on specific areas of revision (e.g. secondary content courses).
  - Provide clarification on any State transition issues (e.g. licensure and/or standards).
  - Highlight uniqueness of this program related to aspects of specific knowledge and skills.
  - Summary tables highlighting new, revised or discontinued course is helpful.
  B. Organization Structure and Instructional Delivery
  - Provide clarity re: new as well as ongoing infrastructure issues that impact redesign efforts (e.g. partner school or IHE departmental designs).
Suggestions –cont.

C. Curriculum & Course Content

- Identify how plans are underway to identify, develop, and support a rich resource of evidence-based practices within your program.
- Reflect on what you have learned from certain courses after incorporating the IRIS and UDL resources.

D. Improvement on Student Support

- Consider the need to advocate for systematic professional development to ensure that those teaching and mentoring students about diversity issues are well trained.

E. Program Evaluation

- Describe key assignments and/or PBAs used as measures of student progress.
- Describe collaborative consortium, institutional structures, and/or online community efforts used to collect data.
Questions and/or feedback about the Year 1 Review requirements and process:

Corinne Weidenthal

corinne.weidenthal@ed.gov

202-245-6529