

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR YEARS 2 - 5

Proposed Activities and Anticipated Outcomes Rationale for Proposed/Future Activities

The main goal of NCLVI is to develop a collaborative leadership doctoral training program in education of students with visual impairments as a way to address the critical shortage of leadership personnel in this field. The project has six objectives, each of which is related to the main goal. Each objective has an anticipated outcome or outcomes and supporting activities. The Timeline of NCLVI Activities as presented in the Project Overview indicates that the project is on target with the first year activities. This discussion will analyze the objectives of the project along with the anticipated outcomes for that objective and will indicate the activities that are proposed for years two through five of the project. The rationale for the Proposed/Future Activities is being presented along with the objectives.

1. Develop a collaborative model for producing leadership personnel in special education with an emphasis on VI through the establishment of a national consortium of Carnegie doctoral/research-intensive and doctoral research-intensive institutions.

Outcome: Establish the National Center for Leadership in Visual Impairment. The collaborative nature of the center has been established, but continued efforts on the part of staff and the individual University Consortium Members as well as the Public Advisors will be required to produce the leaders and develop the model of leadership training.

Activities projected for years two through five of the project:

- Utilizing the guiding principles and policy guidelines that have been developed by the University Consortium and PAC for operation of the collaborative
- Maintaining communication vehicles for NCLVI to function
- Convening annual face-to-face meetings of the university consortium to evaluate and discuss progress in meeting goals for leadership personnel
- Convening semi annual teleconference calls with the Public Advisory Council to update them and continue to involve them in the activities of the collaborative
- Convening a joint Consortium/PAC face-to-face meeting in the final year of the project
- Developing the annual contracts for the Fellowships with University Consortium Members

- Working with the collaborative to recruit additional members to the Consortium.

Rationale:

NCLVI is a collaborative effort. Regular open communication and annual meetings facilitate the effort. University Consortium meetings need to be face-to-face to facilitate leadership preparation and overcoming any barriers that may have emerged during the past year. PAC does not make decisions for NCLVI but provides input and resources. PAC meetings can be held through teleconference calls during all but the final year of the project when having a joint meeting with the Consortium will help in evaluating the collaborative.

2. Facilitate the preparation of leadership personnel in education of students with visual impairments to increase the numbers of doctoral graduates available for positions in one or more areas of emphasis, such as higher education teaching and research, public policy, administration at national state and/or local levels, curriculum development and supervision and/or general research. In particular, prepare sufficient leadership personnel to meet the needs of university personnel preparation programs.

Outcomes:

- NCLVI Fellows earn doctoral degrees from their universities.
- NCLVI Fellows seek and secure leadership positions related to their education.

Activities for years two through five of the project for this objective:

- Recruitment of doctoral fellows for the second cohort
- Critiquing the applicant review process and making necessary modifications for the second cohort
- Reviewing and ranking applications
- Awarding fellowships
- Creating annual contracts
- Distributing funds to the universities
- Maintaining the database of information about fellows
- Tracking Fellows advancement through their programs
- Setting systems in place to track Fellows after graduation for data collection on positions they seek and obtain

Rationale:

Preparing new leadership personnel is at the heart of this project. Facilitating and tracking their preparation is essential for possible replication of the model.

3. Enhance the training of leadership personnel by the creation of enrichment activities such as special topic seminars, special meetings, specialized lectures, or listserv discussions developed for the cohort of doctoral students.

Outcome: The NCLVI Consortium develops and implements a varied and competency based enrichment program for NCLVI Fellows.

Activities for years two through five of the project for this objective:

- Implement enrichment activities following the plan developed in year one. (See Appendix I)
- Work with University Consortium Members and PAC to evaluate plans for enrichment activities for each year and to solicit consultants, externships/internships, and other resources
- Evaluate competencies developed, develop syllabi, schedule courses and face-to-face meetings for each year of the program
- Hire consultants for Enrichment Program
- Maintain listserv for Fellows
- Maintain Blackboard Website for Enrichment Program
- Evaluate the program.

Rationale:

The Added-Value Enrichment Program, which is required for the cohorts, is what is unique about the preparation they will receive. It spreads the knowledge and expertise that exist in separate universities to the entire cohort. The competencies that the Blue-Ribbon Panel recommends for leadership training are being extended to the cohort through this Enrichment Program.

4. Increase the capacity of HECSE members and other universities that have existing doctoral programs, by helping them to establish new minors and emphases in visual impairment.

Outcome: New minors and emphases created in HECSE and other university doctoral programs.

Activities for years two through five of the project:

- HECSE members of PAC, University Consortium and NCLVI Staff will identify other IHE's with capacity
- University Consortium Representatives will discuss benefits for providing new minors or emphases in VI
- New members will be accepted into the Consortium.

Rationale:

At the moment there are only 14 universities that are providing doctoral degrees with an emphasis in visual impairment and blindness. The 25

Fellows produced by this project will not be enough for future needs for leadership positions in the field. Having a doctoral student in an area is an extremely labor intensive proposition. Through the Consortium, the effort can be spread across a number of institutions.

5. Conduct an evaluation of the collaboration --both outcomes and process -- that will provide formative and summative data to assist in improving the project, and detailed information about the development of the collaborative model for replication purposes.

Outcome: Evaluative measures are applied throughout the project to provide the impetus for continuous revision and improvement.

Activities for years two through five of the project:

- Administer the Wilder Collaborative Factors Inventory on an annual basis to the University Consortium Members and to the PAC
- Document activities of the collaborative
- Develop additional instruments as needed
- Maintain databases
- Create post degree tracking instruments and activities.

Rationale:

The heart of the project is the collaborative, which is being developed as a model. Collaboration evolves and is not static. Representation of the types of challenges faced and overcome in reaching consensus is key to the success of a collaborative, and examples of successful collaboration need to include those challenges and how they were overcome. Data about Fellows is key for comparison purposes and also for replication of this model and must be part of the evaluation.

6. Disseminate information about the model, including evaluative findings, for possible replication in other areas of leadership training.

Outcome: Information about the model is disseminated to others who may wish to replicate it.

Activities for years two through five of the project :

- Regular communications to a variety of sources --identified in regular meetings of the consortium and PAC
- Maintain information on website
- Prepare press releases
- Submit required reports
- Publish monograph (year 5)
- Publish peer-reviewed articles (years 3-5)

- Present at appropriate national and international conferences
- Present at OSEP Project Directors' Meeting
- Publications by Consortium members
- Publications by Fellows

Rationale:

For the model to be replicated, information about the model must be disseminated in a manner that will permit others to ask questions in order to assess its relevance to their specific situations. The evaluative findings of the project will assist others in determining if they wish to use the model; other information will assist them in determining how to go about replication.

Funding Availability

The budget that was proposed initially for the project was based upon costs for 10 students in year two, and ten new students in years three, four and five. The anticipated time for completion of the degree was three years. This meant that in the two years following the project timeline two cohorts of 10 students each would still be finishing their doctoral degrees, but with no promise of funding. The writers of the proposal were hopeful that the project would prove successful and that additional funding for the last two cohorts would be provided through the writing of another proposal, or through external sources. This was identified as a problem by the reviewers, and at the initial meeting with OSEP the project was directed to support only two cohorts and to extend the length of time for completion of the degree to four years rather than three.

It was recommended that in year two of the project 15 students would be admitted, and in year three only ten. The ten students who are admitted in year three of the project would finish a year after the project ended. In trying to adjust the funding to match what reviewers recommended, we attempted to look at the fellowship support first. Looking at what was originally requested in terms of Fellowship support, the project requested 90 "fellowship years" of support. A "fellowship year" is equivalent to the support that one fellow receives in one year. The original project supported 10 students in year two, 20 in year three, 30 in year four and 30 in year five of the project, thus a total of 90 "fellowship years." At this point in the project we have admitted 15 students. These students will be supported for four years, which is equivalent to 60 "fellowship years." Although the tuition increases each year, there would be sufficient funding remaining in the original budget request for student support for approximately 30 "fellowship years" which would support the ten students in the second cohort for three of their four years, but not for the last year unless modifications are made to the budget.

Deleted: year.

At the initial meeting with OSEP, which NCLVI Staff and several University Consortium Representatives attended, it was recommended, based upon

comments made by reviewers and OSEP staff, that we provide full tuition for all NCLVI Fellows throughout their four years, and that we take the remaining monies and provide a stipend of a minimum of \$20,000 annually (the actual amount to be determined based upon a formula for cost of living depending upon which University the student was attending). Most likely this will mean that there will be some cost savings in the amounts that were designated to fellowships and tuition taken together, which can be accrued to carry forward into year six.

In year six, the second cohort will be in the final year of their Added-Value Enrichment Plan. That year is designated as the time when Fellows will be doing their internships/externships or completing their dissertations. Travel monies can be saved in year five for the first cohort, since it is anticipated that the internship/externship sites will contribute to the costs of travel. During year six there should be no costs for consultants for the enrichment program, but maintenance of the listserv would be required as would maintaining of the databases and tracking of Fellows who would have just graduated. Communication with the University Consortium and with the PAC will be held through teleconference meetings rather than face-to-face, and thus will incur minimal costs. The changes in numbers of Fellows and length of the years of support that have been made to the original proposal require some reworking to ensure that this last year provides Fellows with the same quality program that the first year cohorts received and that the monies available will stretch to cover administrative costs as well as tuition and stipends. This must be done as part of the Collaborative Agreement with OSEP to ensure that the funding will be available for project activities and to ensure a successful outcome of the collaborative effort.