

5  
0

2

1

5

7

2.5

2.2

2.0

1.8

.6

ART  
-A

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 157

SP 009 562

TITLE An Evaluation of (TIF) Teacher Innovation Funds Awards Program. Parts I and II.  
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Oct 71  
NOTE 104p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58  
DESCRIPTORS \*Educational Innovation; \*Effective Teaching; \*Program Evaluation; \*Teacher Developed Materials; \*Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

This evaluation report is in two main sections, the first dealing with a program in five senior high school areas and involving 96 teachers during 1968-70, the second dealing with a program in one high school and one vocational high school and involving 43 teachers during 1970-71. The programs were established to seek out and fund innovative classroom projects designed by teachers and to demonstrate the school system's faith in the ability and creativity of the individual teacher. All teachers, librarians, counselors, and specialists were eligible to submit proposals, and a committee selected those to be funded. Background information was gathered through interviews, on-site visitations, and seminars using instruments such as a pre-evaluation questionnaire, an evaluation checklist, a post-evaluation questionnaire, and a creativity impact measure. Results indicated a very positive teacher reaction, with many valuable innovative projects. Teachers gained skills in using new techniques, new enriching experiences were provided for the students, learning was improved, attitudes were changed, and improvement was made in oral and written communication. New ideas and techniques were publicized for use by non-involved teachers giving incentives for others to try innovative projects. (MBM)

ED 061157

SP  
N-SG

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-  
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF

(TIF)

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND AWARDS PROGRAM

PART I

PART II

Prepared by

Department of Research and Evaluation

Division of Planning, Innovation and Research

10/71

SP 005562

**PART I**

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards  
Program was funded by an Appropriated  
Budget for the Public School Teacher  
Innovation Fund and by the Philip M. Stern  
Family Foundation.

Sponsored by  
The  
Office of Staff Development

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Superintendent of Schools

Hugh J. Scott

Associate Superintendent-Instructional Services

James C. Guines

Division of Planning, Innovation and Research  
Department of Research and Evaluation

Department Head

Mildred P. Cooper

Secretary

Rozelia M. Stewart

Educational Research and Planning Associate

Herman Cobb, Jr.

Office of Staff Development

Director

Elizabeth Williams

Program Coordinator

Irene S. Rich

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES .....	iv
Summary .....	v, vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background and Rationale .....	1
Purpose of Study .....	1
Definitions .....	1
Delimitations.....	1
II. PROCEDURE .....	2
Sample .....	2
Instruments.....	2
Collection of Data .....	2
Analysis of Data .....	3
III. RESULTS .....	3
IV. DISCUSSION .....	23-25
V. CONCLUSIONS .....	25-26
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
VII. APPENDIXES	
A. Participants' Pre-Questionnaire .....	27
B. Participants' Post-Questionnaire .....	33
C. Round I Participants; Schools; Project Titles, and Grade Levels Taught .....	40
D. Round II Participants; Schools; Project Titles, and Grade Levels Taught .....	45

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I. Number of Years Teaching Experience .....	3
II. Sources of Information About the Existence TIF.....	4
III. Reasons For Seeking an Award (Pre) and Benefits Received (Post)	5
a. Round I Pre .....	5
b. Round II Pre .....	6
c. Round I Post .....	6
IV. Sources of Help in Preparing Project Proposals .....	7
V. Amount of Time Spent Preparing Proposals .....	7
VI. Teachers' Expectations For Proposal Approval.....	8
VII. Amount of Time Needed to Get Project Started After Funding.....	8
VIII. Reaction of the Principals and Other School Personnel to the Project.....	9
IX. Problems In Implementation of Projects.....	9
a. Round I Pre.....	10
b. Round II Pre.....	11
c. Round I Post.....	12
X. Anticipated and Actual Teaching Techniques and Procedures....	13
XI. Participants' Expected Project Outcomes.....	13
XII. The Degree to Which Learning Was Improved.....	14
XIII. Used to Measure Project Outcomes.....	14
XIV. Ratings of Expectations (Round I and II Pre) and Outcomes (Round I Post).....	15
XV. Ratings of Statements Supporting Tables III & XI.....	16
XVI. Techniques and Procedures Which Proved Most Helpful In Implementation.....	17
XVII. The Way A Volunteer Aide Would Be Utilized.....	19
XVIII. Elements to be Included in A Summery Report.....	20
XIX. Results Accomplished Through Publication of A Summary Report.	20
XX. The Degree to Which Help Was Received.....	21
XXI. Forms of Communication Between the Office of Staff Development and TIF Winners Ranked According to Effectiveness.....	22
XXII. Format For the Composite Evaluation.....	22

## Evaluation Summary

Title: Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program

Project Location: Public Schools in the following Senior High School areas:

1. Wilson
2. Western
3. Roosevelt
4. Spingarn
5. Eastern

Date: School Years 1968-69; 1969-70

Target Population: 2156 Teachers

Number Served: 96 Teachers

Staff: Coordinated by the Office of Staff Development

Funding Allotment: \$200 per Teacher plus auxillary funds

### Background and Rationale:

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program was established to seek out and fund innovative classroom projects designed by teachers. It was designed to demonstrate the school system's faith in the ability and creativity of the individual teacher. The program sought to supply teachers with resources and support needed to test their own solutions as they sought to meet the instructional needs of their students.

### Procedures:

All teachers, librarians, and counselors in the target population were invited to submit proposals for innovative classroom projects. Winning proposals were selected by an advisory committee. Awards were made based on the committee's judgement as to how well the proposals met certain criteria.

### Evaluation Plan:

Background information was gathered through interviews with personnel from the Office of Staff Development. In cooperation with the Office of Staff Development, the Department of Research and Evaluation designed the following instruments which were sent to the Award Winners:

1. A Pre Evaluation Questionnaire
2. A Post Evaluation Questionnaire
3. A Creativity Impact Measure

## Results and Discussion:

Feedback was received from eighty-five of the participants. Teachers with innovative projects taught Kindergarden through Senior High School. The main reasons for seeking an award were: (1) To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child; (2) A desire to explore new teaching techniques and; (3) To gain skill in a specific area. Though problems were encountered the participants felt that their reasons for seeking awards were fulfilled.

Through the use of small group instruction, individualized instruction and audio-visual aids the teachers expected to achieve three major outcomes: (1) improved learning; (2) changed attitudes and; (3) improved communications. Using student behavior, teacher observation and teacher-made tests as the main evaluation techniques it was determined that these outcomes were met to a great degree. The teachers felt that their projects had enough value to merit repeating.

## Conclusions and Recommendations:

It was concluded that many valuable innovative projects were sought out, funded and tested by teachers in a variety of grade levels. Teachers gained skills in using new techniques, new enriching experiences were provided for the students, learning was improved, attitudes were changed and improvement was made in oral and written communication.

New ideas and techniques were publicized for use by non-involved teachers giving incentives for others to try innovative projects.

A continuation of the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program is urged. A special effort should be made to eliminate the problems of ordering and receiving materials.

## INTRODUCTION

This is Part I of the evaluation of the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program (TIF). Part I covers the program for the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70. Part II will include this year's program, 1970-71 plus a follow-up on participants included in Part I.

### Background and Rationale

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program was established to seek out and fund innovative classroom projects designed by teachers (either individually, or in teams.) It was designed to concretely demonstrate the school system's faith in recognition and support of the ability and creativity of the individual teacher. The program has sought to supply teachers with resources and support needed to test their own imaginative solutions to concerns within their school as they seek to meet the instructional needs of the students in their classes. Funding was limited to \$200 per teacher and restricted to materials only. Teachers were free to use this amount at their own discretion in purchasing materials.

### Purpose of Study

This report attempts to give an overview of the program from its inception in 1968 through the present school year 1970-71. A great deal of weight is given to the responses of the TIF participants in making an assessment of the funding procedures, project support, the degree to which the project helped the teacher in working with children, the degree to which learning was improved, and also whether other favorable outcomes were apparent. It is hoped that any weaknesses and/or problems in the program will be uncovered so as to improve future TIF programs.

### Definitions

TIF Winners - Teacher Innovation Fund Award program participants who were awarded funds to carry out their individual or team projects.

Round I - the group of teachers awarded during school year 1968-69

Round II - the group of teachers awarded during school year 1969-70

Round III - the group of teachers awarded during school year 1970-71

Grants - Funding for projects in the amount of \$200 per teacher for winning proposals

### Delimitations

Part I of this report presents a recent analysis of the available data collected during the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70. In most instances only percentages were available and the raw data were not present.

## PROCEDURE

### Sample

Round I participants were selected from a population of 920 teachers coming from selected schools located in three areas of the city; namely, Wilson and Western High Schools area, Roosevelt High School area, and Spingarn High School area. All teachers, librarians and counselors were invited to submit proposals involving innovative classroom projects.

An advisory committee composed of personnel from the Office of Staff Development evaluated each proposal received. Awards were made based on the committee's judgement as to how well the plans for the project focused on one or more of the following:

- a. make curriculum relevant to children.
- b. improve the skills of children through innovative teaching techniques.
- c. actively involve children in the learning process.
- d. individualize instruction.

Of the fifty-nine teachers submitting proposals to the Staff Development Office, thirty-nine were awarded TIF grants.

Participants for Round II were drawn from the Eastern-Springarn High Schools area. The population consisted of about 1236 teachers. From this population 96 proposals were received, of which 57 were funded. Again the awards were made on the recommendation of the advisory committee set up by the Office of Staff Development using the same criteria used in Round I.

### Instruments and Collection of Data

Pre- and post- questionnaires developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation were administered to the participants. Due to constraints of time, post-testing of the Round II group was not conducted. However, a follow-up questionnaire entitled "Creativity Impact Measure" developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation was recently administered to participants of Rounds I and II and will be analyzed in conjunction with the assessment of the current year's program. The results will be reported in Part II of this report.

Interviews were held with the staff of the Office of Staff Development. The team from the Department of Research and Evaluation also held a one day workshop with Round I participants wherein a model that teachers could use in evaluating a classroom project was presented.

## Analysis of Data

Items calling for rank order were ranked in numerical order. Percentages were used to show the amount of responses for certain items on the questionnaires. Comparisons were made of the percentages to reveal the differences in responses between Rounds I and II participants and also between the pre and post responses of Round I. The results are shown in tabular and narrative form.

### RESULTS

Pre questionnaires were completed and returned by thirty-four Round I participants and fifty-one Round II participants. Thirty Round I participants completed the post instrument.

The table below shows the teaching experience of the participants.

Table I  
Number of Years Teaching Experience

Years	Number of Teachers	
	Round I	Round II
1-4	8	19
5-9	10	11
10-14	3	7
15-19	3	9
20-29	3	0
30-39	1	2
40-49	1	0
Total	29	48
Mean Years Taught	11.4	5.3

Schools, grade levels taught, and names of the innovative projects are shown in appendices C and D.

Table II presents the sources of information about the TIF program as cited by participating teachers.

Table II  
Sources of Information About The Existence of TIF

Source	Number Responding	
	Round I	Round II
The Principal	20	29
Central Office	11	14
Supervisor	1	3
Another Teacher	1	3
Other:		
bulletin in teacher's room	1	1
union	-	1
Total Responding	34	51

Teachers indicated their reasons for seeking an award by ranking each reason according to its importance from the most to the least. On the post the same items were listed as benefits received as a result of the project and again ranked from the most to the least. For this evaluation all rankings were determined by assigning a numerical value to the first three ranks indicated by the teachers. First choices received a weight of three; second a weight of two; and third a weight of one. Table III gives the overall rankings by each group. Tables III a, b and c give the breakdown for each group.

Table III  
Reasons for Seeking An  
Award (Pre) and Benefits Received (Post)

Reasons	Pre		Post
	Round I	Round II	Round I
To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child	1	1	1
A desire to explore new teaching techniques	2	2	2
To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area	3	3	3
Self-developed competency in a particular area	4.5	5	5
Specialized training in a particular area	4.5	4	4

Table III a.  
Round I Pre

Reasons	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child	26	7	1	100	34
2. A desire to explore new teaching techniques	8	18	4	88	34
3. To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area	0	5	10	44	34
4. Self-developed competency in a particular area	0	1	14	44	34
5. Specialized training in a particular area	1	3	7	32	34

Table III b.  
Round II Pre

Reasons	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child	39	12	0	100	51
2. A desire to explore new teaching techniques	13	21	8	82	51
3. To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area	2	9	25	71	51
4. Specialized training in a particular area	5	3	11	37	51
5. Self-developed competency in a particular area	0	7	5	24	51

Table III c.  
Round I Post

Reasons	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child	23	7	0	100	30
2. A desire to explore new teaching techniques	8	13	5	87	30
3. To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area	2	5	14	70	30
4. Specialized training in a particular area	3	2	7	40	30
5. Self-developed competency in a particular area	0	5	3	27	30

Some of the TIF Winners sought help in preparing their project proposals. Their sources of help are shown in the following table.

Table IV  
Sources of Help in Preparing Project Proposals

Helpers	Number Responding	
	Round I	Round II
No one	12	19
Co-teacher	11	26
Other	4	4
Supervisor	4	0
Subject Specialist	2	1
Principal	1	1
University Personnel	0	0
<b>Total Responding</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>51</b>

The length of time teachers took to prepare their proposals is shown in the table below.

Table V  
Amount of Time Spent Preparing Proposal

Time	Teachers Responding	
	Round I	Round II
Less than eight hours	11	11
Eight to sixteen hours	6	20
Seventeen to twenty-four hours	6	6
Twenty-five to forty hours	5	2
Forty or more hours	6	12
<b>Total Responding</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>51</b>

The TIF Winners had high expectations that their proposal would win approval as is shown in Table VI.

Table VI  
Teachers' Expectations For Proposal Approval

Degree of Expectation	Number Responding	
	Round I	Round II
Highly probable	16	13
Probable	10	23
Uncertain	6	12
Not probable	2	3
Total Responding	34	51

Round I participants indicated, on the post, the length of time needed to get their projects started after funding. The results are shown in the following table.

Table VII  
Amount of Time Needed to Get Project Started After Funding

Amount of Time	Number Responding
Less than three days	0
Four to five days	2
Two weeks	2
A month	6
More than a month	20
Total Responding	30

Round I participants indicated the reactions of the principals and other school personnel to their projects. The results from the post instrument are shown in the following table.

Table VIII  
Reaction of the Principals and Other  
School Personnel to the Projects

Reaction	Number Responding
Highly favorable	15
Favorable	6
Indifferent	8
Unfavorable	1
Total Responding	30

Problems encountered by the teachers were ranked in numerical order, beginning with the problem considered to be the greatest to the one considered to be the least. The overall rankings are shown in Table IX. The breakdown for each group is shown in Tables IX a, IX b and IX c.

Table IX  
Problems In Implementation of Projects

Problems	Rank		
	Round I	Pre	Post
		Round II	Round I
Difficulty in ordering materials	1	2	1
Unavailability of materials	2	1	2
Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program	3	3.5	3
Inadequate physical facility	4	3.5	5
Lack of cooperation by parents	5	6	8
Student apathy	6	8	7
Little or no assistance from resource personnel	7	7	6
Lack of cooperation by school staff	8	5	9
Other	9	9	4

Table IX a.  
Round I Pre

Problems	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. Difficulty in ordering materials	19	9	1	85	34
2. Unavailability of materials	8	4	16	82	34
3. Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program	4	15	2	62	34
4. Inadequate physical facility	8	2	8	53	34
5. Lack of cooperation by parents	2	2	4	24	34
6. Student apathy		6		18	34
7. Little or no assistance from resource personnel	2	2		12	34
8. Lack of cooperation by school staff			2	6	34

Table IX b.  
Round II Pre

Problems	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. Unavailability of materials	31	14	2	92	51
2. Difficulty in ordering materials	21	21	6	94	51
3. Difficulty in integrating project in the total school program	14	18		63	51
4. Inadequate physical facility	13	13	17	84	51
5. Lack of cooperation by school staff	17			33	51
6. Lack of cooperation by parents	8		9	33	51
7. Little or no assistance from resource personnel		9	9	35	51
8. Student apathy		11		22	51
9. Other	4	2		12	51
Unable to implement	2				
Need for additional planning	1	1			
Lack of time	1	1			
No problem		2		4	51

Table IX c.  
Round I Post

Problems	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. Difficulty in ordering materials	9	5	4	60	30
2. Unavailability of materials	6	3		30	30
3. Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program	3	3	3	30	30
4. Other	4	2		20	30
Lack of time	3				
Class size		2			
Range of ability	1				
5. Inadequate physical facilities	3	2		17	30
6. Little or no assistance from resource personnel		1	1	7	30
7. Student apathy		1		3	30
8. Lack of cooperation by parents			1	3	30
9. Lack of cooperation by school staff					30
No problem		4			30

The participants indicated the techniques and procedures they planned to use to obtain their objectives. The techniques and procedures actually used to attain the objectives were indicated by Round I on the post. The responses are shown in Table X.

Table X  
Anticipated and Actual Teaching Techniques and Procedures

Techniques and Procedures	Number Responding			Percent of Responses		
	Pre		Post	Pre		Post
	Round I	Round II	Round I	Round I	Round II	Round I
Small group instruction	9	13	7	26	25	23
Audio-visual aids	8	10	7	24	20	23
Individualize instruction	7	12	7	21	23	23
Establishment of learning stations	4	5	4	12	10	14
Remedial help	4	9	3	12	18	10
Other	2	2	2	5	4	7
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Round I and II indicated their expected project outcomes on the pre instrument. The expected outcomes were ranked based on the number of responses each received. The results are shown in Table XI.

Table XI  
Participants' Expected Project Outcomes

Expected Outcomes	Number Responding		Percent of Responses	
	Round I	Round II	Round I	Round II
Improve learning	8	12	24	24
Change attitudes	8	11	24	22
Improve communication	7	8	21	16
Organize information	4	4	12	8
Individualize instruction	3	7	9	14
Improve discipline	2	6	5	11
Write curriculum materials	2	3	5	5
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

On the post instrument Round I participants indicated the degree to which learning was improved as a result of the projects. The results of their responses are shown below.

Table XII  
The Degree To Which Learning Was Improved

Degree	Number Responding	Percent of Responses
Much improvement	17	57
Improved	12	40
Little Improved	1	3
No improvement		
Total Responses	30	100

The methods used by Round I participants to measure their project outcomes are shown in Table XIII.

Table XIII  
Used To Measure Project Outcomes

Methods	Number Responding	Percent of Responses
Student's behavior	9	30
Observation by teachers	8	27
Teacher-made tests	4	13
Standardized tests	3	10
Student's attitude	3	10
Observation by other school personnel	3	10
Total Responses	30	100

TABLE XIV

Ratings of Expectations (Round I and II Pre) and (Round I Post)

Statements	Percent of Responses													
	Round I Pre				Round II Pre				Round I Post				Not at all	
	Very Well	Well	Fairly Well	Poor	Very Well	Well	Fairly Well	Poor	Very Well	Well	Fairly Well	Poor		
1. Help me identify children's needs.	44	50	3	3	61	29	6	4	48	37	7	4	4	
2. Give clues for understanding children's needs.	47	41	12	0	58	34	6	2	44	33	22	0	0	
3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs.	43	39	18	0	47	37	16	0	37	52	11	0	0	
4. Develop ways of motivating children	82	12	6	0	73	22	6	0	61	36	4	0	0	
5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children.	59	34	7	0	59	29	12	0	56	37	7	0	0	
6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in content areas.	9	39	39	13	45	35	18	2	59	22	15	0	4	
7. Give training in the use of devices to measure growth of children.	52	41	7	0	16	47	18	18	22	19	30	11	19	
8. Provide training that will lead to change in attitudes.	52	39	9	0	53	25	18	4	62	27	8	4	0	
9. Make all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.	49	39	12	0	41	37	18	4	27	31	35	4	4	
10. Promote better working relationships for entire school staff.	16	23	48	13	25	21	40	15	7	4	30	15	44	
11. Improve working relationships with parents and other community agencies.	38	21	38	3	20	37	25	18	4	35	38	4	19	
12. Make school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.	39	27	31	3	29	41	24	6	7	19	26	15	33	
13. Promote a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.	56	28	13	3	68	20	8	4	50	23	12	15	0	
14. Identify varied audio-visual equipment.	53	22	19	6	35	27	31	6	44	11	19	11	15	
15. Develop skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment.	48	19	10	23	28	38	18	16	27	27	12	4	31	
16. Instruct use of classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.	53	25	11	11	47	31	14	8	52	20	8	4	16	
17. Instruct in the development of reasonable behavioral objectives.	44	44	12	0	45	43	8	4	35	38	15	0	12	
18. Serve as a motivator for the regular school year program.	65	22	13	0	70	26	4	0	63	25	8	4	0	
Mean	47	31	17	4	46	32	16	6	39	28	17	5	11	
Mean (Well & Very Well)	78.5				77.7				66.7					

Part II of the pre instrument was designed to measure the participants' expectations in a variety of areas. Part II of the post was designed to measure the same areas to see to what degree these expectations were met. Participants rated eighteen statements on a scale ranging from very well to poor. An overall mean was computed for each Round. "Very Well" and "Well" responses were combined and a mean was computed. See Table XIV on the preceding page.

The mean of the combined "very well" and "well" responses is 78.5 and 66.7 on the pre and post respectively for Round I participants, making a difference of 11.9. A t-test was applied to test whether the difference was significant. The obtained t is 2.63 with 17 df, this t is significant at the 5% level. We concluded that the degree of accomplishment in the areas listed in Table XIV was significantly less than the degree of expectations.

The three main reasons for seeking an award (Table III) and the three main expected outcomes (Table XI) lead us to analyze those statements from Table XIV that are applicable. See Table XV.

Table XV  
Ratings of Statements Supporting Tables III and XI

Statements	Percent of Responses			
	Round I Pre		Round I Post	
	Very Well	Well	Very Well	Well
1. Help me identify children's needs	94		85	
2. Give clues for understanding children's needs	88		77	
3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs	82		89	
4. Develop ways of motivating children	94		97	
5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children	93		93	
6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in content areas	48		81	
7. Provide training that will lead to change in attitudes	91		89	
Mean	84.3		87.3	

A t-test applied to these means produces a t score of .55. With 6 df a score of 2.4 is needed at the 5% level to be significant. We conclude that there is no significant difference in the degree of expectations and the degree of accomplishments in the areas listed in Table XV.

Both Rounds of participants were asked the following question , "What do you see as a way/ways to make the Teacher Innovation Fund-Pilot Program have more meaning for teachers? (please list.)" Following is a list compiled from the responses of both groups on the pre instrument.

1. Publicize the TIF program through booklets, newspapers, films and other news media.
2. Hold demonstrations and seminars for teachers not involved.
3. Inform and develop enthusiasm among principals and supervisors.
4. Provide more funding for materials.
5. Develop better methods for ordering and receiving materials.
6. Give participants more planning time.
7. Allow more time for ordering materials.
8. Award grants in April or June so plans and materials are ready in September.
9. Provide funds to continue projects.

The remaining results are all from the post instrument and was supplied by thirty Round I participants.

Thirteen of the participants stated that knowledge of innovative practices has impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers. Eight said it did not have an impact and nine responded "don't know."

Twenty-eight of the participants said that their projects have value to merit repeating. Two gave no response to this item.

Twenty-six of the participants indicated that they would change their projects at least a little while four indicated they would not change their project in any way.

Seventeen of the participants indicated that they could repeat their projects in the same form without funds. Twenty-nine indicated

they could repeat their projects in an adapted form without funds.

On the post instrument Round I participants were asked to rank those techniques and procedures which proved most helpful in implementing their projects. The results are shown in Table XVI.

Table XVI  
Techniques and Procedures Which Proved  
Most Helpful In Implementation

Techniques and Procedures	Number Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
Individualized instruction	5	3	3	37	30
Small group instruction	5	3	2	33	30
Audio-visual aids	5	2	2	30	30
Field trips	2	3		17	30
Learning stations	3		2	17	30
Remedial help		1	3	13	30
Paperbacks and magazines	1		1	7	30

Table XVII shows the many ways a volunteer aide would be utilized by each TIF winner.

Table XVII  
The Way A Volunteer Aide Would Be Utilized

Activity	No. of Responses	Percent of Responses
Supervise small groups and individualized work	18	45
Checking students' work	5	12
Making new creative materials	3	7
Teaching and leading games	3	7
Assist on field trips	3	7
Help maintain records	2	5
Others:	7	17
typing	1	
dittoing	1	
operate audio-visual equipment	1	
filing	1	
fixing bulletin boards	1	
locate available resources	1	
help direct playlets	1	
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100</b>

In writing a summary report for the TIF Program participants indicated that the elements shown in Table XVIII should be included.

Table XVIII  
Elements to be Included in A Summary Report

Elements	Number Responding	Percent of Responses
A condensed summary of each individual project	9	30
The evaluation done by the individual teachers	8	27
Use of pictures and slides	8	27
Data collected by the Department of Research and Evaluation	5	16
Total Responses	30	100

The participants felt that the following results can be accomplished through publication of a summary report.

Table XIX  
Results Accomplished Through  
Publication of A Summary Report

Objectives	Number Responding	Percent of Responses
Motivation for instituting innovative projects	8	26
Resource for new teachers	6	20
Community public relations resource	6	20
Increased interest by participating teachers	5	17
Interest by non-participating teachers	5	17
Total Responses	30	100

The participants indicated the degree to which they received help in implementing their project. The results are shown in the following table.

Table XX  
The Degree To Which Help Was Received

Source	Number Responding			Total
	Much	Little	Not At All	
Group meetings involving all grant winners	25	5		30
Assistance from the Office of Staff Development	22	7	1	30
Support from your principal	12	16	2	30
Support from other school staff	9	11	10	30
A substitute teacher for half a day	15	4	11	30
Assistance from the Department of Research and Evaluation	8	7	15	30

The participants were asked to indicate which form of communication between the Office of Staff Development and participating teachers appeared to be more effective by ranking them from most to least. The results are shown on the next page.

Table XXI  
Forms of Communication Between The Office of Staff  
Development and TIF Winners Ranked According To Effectiveness

Forms of Communication	Number Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
1. Classroom visits by staff of Office of Staff Development	10	4	5	63	30
2. Talking to teachers	6	7	2	50	30
3. Meetings	5	2	6	43	30
4. Reading the notices that appear in your mailbox	4	3	1	27	30
5. Staff development bulletins		5	5	33	30
6. The principal	1	2		10	30
7. Notices displayed on bulletin boards	1		1	7	30
8. Reading the "Grapevine"			3	10	30
9. City newspaper		1		3	30

Table XXII shows the participants preferences for the format of the composite evaluation.

Table XXII  
Format For The Composite Evaluation

Format	Number Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd	Total Responding
	1st	2nd	3rd		
Film	7	6	2	50	30
Pamphlet	6	4	7	57	30
Book	5	4	4	43	30
Filmstrip	2	4	8	47	30
Brochure	2	3	5	33	30
Record	1	1	6	27	30

## DISCUSSION

The Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program did seek out and fund innovative classroom projects that were designed by teachers. Funded teachers taught at the elementary, junior high and senior high school levels. As a group these teachers averaged more than five years teaching experience.

The majority of the teachers indicated that they found out about the program from their principals. This seems to indicate acceptance of the program and a willingness by the principals for their teachers to be involved.

The three main reasons given for seeking awards were; (1) To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child; (2) A desire to explore new teaching techniques and; (3) To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area.

In writing their project proposals most of the teachers seeking help received this help from a co-teacher. This shows the involvement and cooperation by other staff from the outset of the project. Seventy percent of the teachers who were awarded thought it at least probable that their proposal would win approval. This indicates the confidence the teachers had in their project.

Twenty of the thirty teachers responding on the post instrument indicated that it took more than a month to get their project started after funding. They indicated that the three main problems encountered were; (1) difficulty in ordering materials; (2) unavailability of materials and; (3) difficulty in integrating the project into the total school program. These teachers listed these same problems in the same order on their pre instrument. In an interview with the program coordinator it was learned that some of the teachers in Round I purchased some materials with their own money and were later reimbursed. Others purchased on credit and presented the bills to the finance office for payment. Some orders were placed directly with the central school supply office.

To alleviate the problems of materials a different procedure was followed for Round II participants. They submitted their requests for supplies to the Office of Staff Development. The Office of Staff Development submitted the orders to the supply office. This procedure did not eliminate the problems surrounding materials. Round II participants cited the same three problems as the main ones encountered. The only change was that "unavailability of materials" was ranked first, followed by "difficulty in ordering materials."

The participants planned to utilize small group instruction, individualized instruction, and audio-visual aids as their main techniques and procedure. It was indicated on the post that these three techniques proved to be the most helpful in implementing the projects.

The teachers expected improved learning, changed attitudes, and improved communications to be the major outcomes of their projects. Twenty-nine of the thirty teachers responding on the post instrument indicated that learning was improved. One indicated that learning was a little improved. The three main methods used to measure the outcomes were; (1) student behavior; (2) observation by teachers and; (3) teacher-made test.

In rating a long list of expectations (see Table XIV) 78.5 and 77.7 percent of Round I and Round II's responses respectively indicated that these expectations would be met "well" or "very well". At the end of the project 66.7 percent of Round I's responses indicated these expectations were actually met "well" or "very well". A t test was applied to test for significant difference between the pre and post responses of Round I participants. A t score of 2.6 indicated a significant difference at the 5% level of confidence. We can assert with confidence that there was a significant difference between the responses of Round I participants before and after. All of the expectations were not met as well as the participants predicted they would be met. However, all of the expectations on the list were not included in the TIF winners reasons for seeking an award, or in their expected outcomes as shown in Tables III and XI respectively. In an analysis of those expectations supporting the three main reasons for seeking an award and the three main expected outcomes (see Table XV) 84.3 percent and 87.3 percent of the responses of Round I participants on the pre and post respectively were "well" or "very well". A t test was applied. The difference between the pre and post responses was not significant. The participants felt quite sure these expectations would be met and indicated to the same degree that they were met.

Twenty-eight of the thirty responding to the post instrument felt that their project had enough value to merit repeating. Twenty-six indicated that they would change their projects a little in carrying it out again. Seventeen felt that they could repeat their projects without additional funds. Twenty-nine felt they could repeat their project in an adapted form without funds.

The majority of the teachers would use an aide, if one was available for three hours a day, to supervise small groups and individualized work.

The three sources of most help to the teachers were; (1) group meetings involving all grant winners; (2) assistance from the Office of Staff Development and support from the principal. Classroom visits by members of the Office of Staff Development was rated as the best form of communication between TIF Winners and the Office of Staff Development followed by talking with other teachers and meetings.

Participants' responses concerning a summary report for the TIF program, along with their suggestions of ways to make the program more meaningful for teachers lead to a series of outcomes. First, many evaluation meetings were held; color slides, video tapes and pictures were shared by participants in "Show and Tell" sessions. Second, reports on innovative projects were assembled. Third and probably the most important outcome was

the approval of a proposal submitted by the Office of Staff Development to the Department of Federal Programs which led to the establishment of the Innovative Methods Processing Center (IMP).

The IMP Center is a resource bank and talent pool for the diffusion of effective programs. A complete description of each TIF project is on file at the center. These innovative ideas are disseminated to other teachers from the center.

A book entitled "A Guide To Innovative Projects" was published and distributed by the center. The book contains resumes of process summaries of each TIF project. When other teachers visit the IMP Center, located at Dunbar High School, they can see a slide show of the TIF awards winners carrying out their innovative programs. They can learn about the materials and equipment needed for innovative techniques. Six TIF winners are repeating their projects this year. These six teachers were refunded for the purpose of keeping their classrooms open to visitors who want to see a TIF program in action. In addition thirty of the TIF Winners volunteered to be "open line" teachers. They are available for advice and consultation for new teachers implementing innovative projects.

As a result of all these varied activities many teachers are trying innovative projects without the benefit of awards.

#### CONCLUSIONS

In analysis of the data on the Teachers Innovative Fund program seems to warrant the following conclusions:

1. Teachers were given the opportunity to make their own special idea come true in their classroom.
2. Many different innovative programs resulted.
3. Learning was improved and made more exciting.
4. Motivation was increased among teachers and children involved in the projects.
5. New teaching techniques for individualizing instruction were developed and tried.
6. Attitudes towards learning were changed.
7. New and additional teaching materials were acquired.
8. New ideas and techniques were publicized for use by non involved teachers through demonstrations, books and seminars.
9. Incentives were given for others to try innovative projects.
10. Expertise was developed and used to help others.
11. Abilities and skills needed to compile and disseminate materials and ideas were acquired by the TIF winners.

12. A resource bank and talent pool was established.

A typical testimonial of the TIF winners made by one participant states: "It's been a great, out-of-the-rut year... to be able at last to really look at my kids, try out my own ideas. And look at the parents' response - they're right with us. Being a part of the TIF program has made me, as a teacher feel important too".

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Schedule the awarding of grants by the end of the school year for the succeeding school year.
2. Develop a better procedure for ordering and receiving materials.
3. Schedule regular visits to each project by Staff of Office of Staff Development.
4. Give special attention to the flexibility of the school's program in considering an innovative project.
5. Physical facilities should be considered when deciding on an innovative project.

**Appendix A**  
**Pre Questionnaire**

Dear Participant:

The Staff Development Office is interested in finding out how you feel about the individual project you have selected for experimentation in your classroom. Thus, we are asking that you respond to a few statements.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grade/Subject \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Years you have taught \_\_\_\_\_

1. How did you find out about the existence of the Teacher Innovation Grants?

\_\_\_\_\_ Central school office \_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor  
\_\_\_\_\_ Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify)

2. For what reasons did you seek an award? (Please rank from most to least.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Specialized training in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Self-developed competency in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ a desire to explore new teaching techniques  
\_\_\_\_\_ to gain additional skill in a specific teaching area  
\_\_\_\_\_ to provide an additional and/or enriching experience for the child  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other

3. Who aided you in preparing your proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_ University personnel \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Specialist \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor  
\_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Co-Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ No one \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)

4. How long did it take you to prepare your proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_ less than eight hours  
\_\_\_\_\_ eight to sixteen hours  
\_\_\_\_\_ seventeen to twenty-four hours  
\_\_\_\_\_ twenty-five to forty hours  
\_\_\_\_\_ forty or more

5. To what degree did you expect your proposal to win approval?

\_\_\_\_\_ highly probable  
\_\_\_\_\_ probable  
\_\_\_\_\_ uncertain  
\_\_\_\_\_ not probable

6. What problems did you encounter in the initial implementation of the program?  
(Please rank from greatest to least)

- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of cooperation by school staff
- \_\_\_\_\_ student apathy
- \_\_\_\_\_ unavailability of materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ inadequate physical facility
- \_\_\_\_\_ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program
- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of cooperation by parents
- \_\_\_\_\_ little or no assistance from resource personnel
- \_\_\_\_\_ difficulty in ordering materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ other

7. How much time did it take you to get your program with the students started?

- \_\_\_\_\_ less than one day
- \_\_\_\_\_ one to two days
- \_\_\_\_\_ three to four days
- \_\_\_\_\_ five to six days
- \_\_\_\_\_ seven days or more

8. What techniques and procedures will you use to obtain your objectives?

- \_\_\_\_\_ individualize instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ small group instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ remedial help
- \_\_\_\_\_ audio-visual aides
- \_\_\_\_\_ establishment of learning stations
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify)

9. What are your expected outcomes?

- \_\_\_\_\_ improve learning
- \_\_\_\_\_ individualize instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ improve communication
- \_\_\_\_\_ organize information

9. What are your expected outcomes? (continued)

\_\_\_\_\_ improve discipline

\_\_\_\_\_ change attitudes

\_\_\_\_\_ write curriculum materials

10. What do you see as a way/ways to make the Teacher Innovation Fund-Pilot Program have more meaning for teachers? (please list)

Part II

Before implementing the project you chose, you must have had some idea as to how the project would develop. You probably asked, how will this project help me in working with children. Listed below are a number of statements regarding possible expectations by teachers. Therefore, we are asking that you rate the following statements using very well, well, fairly well, or poor.

The project will:

1. Help me identify children's needs.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
2. Give clues for understanding children's needs.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
4. Develop ways of motivating children.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in content areas.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
7. Give training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
8. Provide training that will lead to a change in attitudes.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
9. Make all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
10. Promote better working relationships for entire school staff.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
11. Improve working relationships with parents and other community agencies.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
12. Make school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor

13. Promote a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
14. Identify varied audio-visual equipment.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
15. Develop skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
16. Instruct use of classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
17. Instruct in the development of reasonable behavioral objectives.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor
18. Serve as a motivator for the regular school year program.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ very well    \_\_\_\_\_ well    \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well    \_\_\_\_\_ poor

Prepared by  
 Department of Research and Evaluation  
 March 17, 1970

**Appendix B**  
**Post Questionnaire**

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND  
Post-Evaluation Instrument

Dear Participant:

The Staff Development Office is interested in finding out how you feel about the individual project you have used for experimentation in your classroom. Thus, we are asking that you respond to a few statements.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Grade/Subject \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Years you have taught \_\_\_\_\_

1. What benefits have you received as a result of being awarded a grant. (Please rank from most to least.)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Specialized training in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Self-developed competency in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Freedom to explore new teaching techniques  
\_\_\_\_\_ The gain of additional skill in a specific teaching area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Provision for additional and/or enriching experiences for the child  
\_\_\_\_\_ None  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)
2. Who aided you in implementing your proposal?  
\_\_\_\_\_ University personnel \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Specialist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Co-Teacher  
\_\_\_\_\_ No one \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)
3. After having received grant approval, how long did it take you to get your program /project started?  
\_\_\_\_\_ less than three days  
\_\_\_\_\_ four to five days  
\_\_\_\_\_ two weeks  
\_\_\_\_\_ a month  
\_\_\_\_\_ more than a month
4. What was the reaction of the principal and other school personnel regarding your program/project?  
\_\_\_\_\_ highly favorable  
\_\_\_\_\_ favorable  
\_\_\_\_\_ indifferent  
\_\_\_\_\_ unfavorable  
\_\_\_\_\_ extremely critical
5. What problems did you encounter in the implementation of the program? (Please rank from greatest to least)  
\_\_\_\_\_ lack of cooperation by school staff  
\_\_\_\_\_ student apathy  
\_\_\_\_\_ unavailability of materials  
\_\_\_\_\_ inadequate physical facility  
\_\_\_\_\_ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program  
\_\_\_\_\_ lack of cooperation by parents  
\_\_\_\_\_ little or no assistance from resource personnel  
\_\_\_\_\_ difficulty in ordering materials  
\_\_\_\_\_ other

6. What techniques and procedures did you use to obtain your objectives?

- \_\_\_\_\_ individualized instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ small group instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ remedial help
- \_\_\_\_\_ audio-visual aides
- \_\_\_\_\_ establishment of learning stations
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (Please specify)

7. Which of the above techniques and procedures proved most helpful in implementing your program? (see question 6)

8. To what degree was learning improved as a result of implementation of your program/project?

- \_\_\_\_\_ much improved
- \_\_\_\_\_ improved
- \_\_\_\_\_ little improvement
- \_\_\_\_\_ no improvement

9. How did you measure your outcomes?

- \_\_\_\_\_ standardized tests
- \_\_\_\_\_ teacher-made tests
- \_\_\_\_\_ observation by teachers
- \_\_\_\_\_ observation by other school personnel
- \_\_\_\_\_ student's behavior
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (specify)

10. Does knowledge of innovative practices of teachers have any impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_ do not know  
If yes, please specify how \_\_\_\_\_

11. Does the project have enough value for students to merit repetition? \_\_\_\_\_

12. Would you change the project in any way? \_\_\_\_\_ a lot \_\_\_\_\_ a little \_\_\_\_\_ not at all

13. Can you repeat it without funds?

In the same form. yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_  
In an adapted form. yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_

14. If you had a volunteer aide for three hours a week what way would you use him?  
Please list.

15. What elements should the Office of Staff Development include when writing a summary report for the TIF program?

- \_\_\_\_\_ the evaluations done by the individual teachers
- \_\_\_\_\_ use of pictures and slides
- \_\_\_\_\_ the results of the data collected by the Dept. of Research and Evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ a condensed summary of each individual project
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (Please specify)

16. The following can be accomplished through the publicizing of a summary report:

- \_\_\_\_\_ increased interest by participating teachers
- \_\_\_\_\_ interest by non-participating teachers
- \_\_\_\_\_ resource for new teachers
- \_\_\_\_\_ motivator for instituting innovative programs and projects
- \_\_\_\_\_ community public relations resource
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify)

17. To what degree have the following helped you implement your program/project?"

- \_\_\_\_\_ a substitute teacher for a half day
- \_\_\_\_\_ assistance from the Office of Staff Development
- \_\_\_\_\_ assistance from the Department of Research and Evaluation
- \_\_\_\_\_ group meetings involving all grant winners
- \_\_\_\_\_ support from your principal
- \_\_\_\_\_ support from other school staff

Much	Little	Not at all

18. Which form of communication between the Staff Development Office and teachers appears to be effective? (Please rank from most to least)

- \_\_\_\_\_ talking to teachers
- \_\_\_\_\_ reading the "Grapevine"
- \_\_\_\_\_ reading the notices that appear in your mailbox
- \_\_\_\_\_ notices displayed on bulletin boards
- \_\_\_\_\_ the principal
- \_\_\_\_\_ city newspaper
- \_\_\_\_\_ meetings
- \_\_\_\_\_ staff-development bulletins
- \_\_\_\_\_ classroom visit by staff of Office of Staff Development
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify)

19. What format do you think the composite evaluation should take?

- \_\_\_\_\_ book
- \_\_\_\_\_ film
- \_\_\_\_\_ pamphlet
- \_\_\_\_\_ brochure
- \_\_\_\_\_ film strip
- \_\_\_\_\_ record
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (Please specify)

20. Now that you have had time for your project, what do you see as a way/ways to make the Teacher Innovation Fund-Pilot Program have more meaning for teachers? (Please list)

Part II

Before implementing the project you chose, you must have had some idea as to how the project would develop. You probably asked, how will this project help me in working with children. Listed below are a number of statements regarding possible expectations by teachers. On a previous occasion you responded to these questions, may we have your response again. Therefore, we are asking that you rate the following statements using very well, well, fairly well, poor, or not at all.

The project:

1. Helped me identify children's needs.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
2. Gave clues for understanding children's needs.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
3. Provided possible solutions to meet children's needs.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
4. Developed ways of motivating children.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor\_\_not at all
5. Provided varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating children.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
6. Provided innovative teaching techniques in content areas.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
7. Gave training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
8. Provided training that led to a change in attitudes.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
9. Made all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
10. Promoted better working relationships for entire school staff.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
11. Improved working relationships with parents and other community agencies.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
12. Made school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
13. Promoted a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all
14. Identified varied audio-visual equipment.  
\_\_\_\_\_ very well \_\_\_\_\_ well \_\_\_\_\_ fairly well \_\_\_\_\_ poor \_\_not at all



**Appendix C**  
**Round I Participants, Schools,**  
**Project Titles and Grade Levels**

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND GROUP 1. 1968-69

Name	School	Phone	Grade	Title of Project	Code
Bolling, Sonja	Truesdell 125 V St., N.W.	629-2427 483-7162	Kgn.	Phonovisual Prog.	0110
Boylan, Mary N.	Barnard 7333 New Hampshire Ave. West Hyattsville, Md.	629-2608 439-9696	3	Oral and Written English	0108
Bradford, Grace	Woodson 641 Ingraham St., N.W.	629-3193 TU2-5137	Jr. High Music	Recorder Consort	0741
Brock, Frances	Macfarland 318 Webster St., N.W.	629-2600 829-6943	7-8	Time Space and Matter	0461
Brussat, Mona	Hearst	629-2628	4-6	Classroom in Museum	0305
Bushlow, Patricia	Eaton	629-2612	Spec. Ed.	Special Education	0306
Clark, Mildred	Truesdell 4227 Blagden Ave., NW	629-2427 291-6708	4	Individual Instruction in Reading	0109
Collins, Nancy	Benning 4427 C St., S.E.	629-2470 581-5299	3-4	Reading is Thinking	0106
Davis, Ruth	Lafayette 3009 Daniel La., NW	629-2632 362-8507	Kgn.-6	Music and Monotones	0746
Derricotte, Marcia	Macfarland 1001 Spring St., Silver Spring, Md.	629-2600 585-6982	Jr. High English	Lang. Arts, List., Sp., Read. & Writing	0111

Name	School	Phone	Grade	Title of Project	Code
Desan, Elizabeth	<del>Fillmore-Hyde</del> <i>Strimke</i> 1620 29th St., N.W.	629-2545 462-2981	1-6	Remedial Reading	0116
Dodge, Edna K.	Hearst	629-2628	4-6	Classroom Museum	0305
Edmonds, Earline	Kenilworth 3900 14th St., N.W.	629-2621 829-0533	1st	Tri-Media	0103
Ferman, Bertha P.	Hearst	629-2628	4-6	Classroom Museum	0305
Fisher, Belford	Truesdell 1813 Franklin St., NE	629-2427 832-3615	Remedial Read. & Arithm.	Leaders of Tomorrow	0901
Fletcher, Jennie	Clark 5117 N. Capitol	629-2769 526-9016	Kgn.	Listening Skills	0112
Gibson, Gloria	Truesdell 1605 Kennedy Pl., NW	629-2427 723-1732	Kgn.-6	Individualized Phonovisual Prog.	0110
Glaser, Rose L.	Deal 1916 Spruce Dr., NW	629-2629 726-8850	Jr. High History & English	English & History	0121
Hatkin, Gertrude	Janney 5614 Oak Place, Bethesda, Md.	629-2490 530-3673	5	Life in the U.S.	0303
Jackson, Mary A.	Oyster 5322 5th St., N.W.	629-2451 TA9-9048	6	Creative Writing	0120
Mitchell, Cynthia	Woodson 2029 Trumbull Ter. NW	629-3193 723-0281	Jr. High Music	Kodaly - Richards Method	0743
Mitchell, Pauline	Kelly Miller 1001 3rd St., S.W.	629-4771 638-2573	Jr. High Com. Lab.	Communication Lab.	0105

Name	School	Phone	Grade	Title of Project	Code
Muckleroy, Johnetta	Jackson 3435 Yuma St., N.W.	629-2437 362-7647	5-6	Drawing Movies	0701
Nusenko, Gail	Horace Mann 6822 Kenyon Dr., Alex., Va.	629-2631 765-7561	S.M.R.	Absorption	0123 S.M.R.
Parker, Marie S.	Hyde	629-2519	4	Reading	0115
Phillips, Barbara	Janney 3909 McKinley St., NW	629-2490 244-6682	5	Life in the U.S.	0303
Reed, Daisy	Truesdell 2611 33rd St., S.E.	629-2427 582-1558	4	Individual Instruc- tion in Reading	0109
Robinson, Ethel D.	Kenilworth 2200 Upshur St., N.E.	629-2621 529-7436	2 N.G.	Tri-Media	0103
Rogers, Margaret	Kenilworth 4721 Texas Ave., S.E.	629-2621 581-4429	2 N.G.	Tri-Media	0103
Sargent, Mary E.	Eaton 3925 Chesterbrook Rd. Arlington, Va.	629-2612 536-5734	Kgn.-6	Music Resource Center	0745
Sheridan, Kathleen	Stoddert	629-2637	Kgn.-6	Creative Dramatics	0122
Skartvedt, May O.	Murch 4400 East West Hwy. Bethesda, Md.	629-2613 654-1165	Kgn.-6	Improved Library Service	0114
Snow, Roberta	Hyde 1327 35th St.,	629-2519 965-9315	5-6	Insects	0463
Utsey, Glenda	Hearst 2939 Van Ness St., NW	629-2628 362-2982	4-6	Literature in Fourth Grade	0119

Name	School	Phone	Grade	Title of Project	Code
Vaughn, Jean	West P.O. Box 2456	629-2535 882-7396	3	Our City	0302
Washington, Jonelle	Macfarland 116 Longfellow St., NW	629-2600 TU2-5948	Jr. High Math.	Mathematics	0402
Williams, Carolyn	Benning 4744 Benning Rd., S.E.	629-2470 581-8781	Nongraded Primary	Sixth Grade	0107
Williams, Thelma	Kenilworth 4740 Benning Rd., S. E.	629-2612 583-0560	Nongraded 2	Tri-Media	0103
Wilson, Jacqueline	Benning 326 Taylor St., N.W.	629-2470 726-4419	4	Reading is Thinking	0106

**Appendix D**  
**Round II Participants, Schools**  
**Project Titles and Grade Levels**

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969-70

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE LEVEL	PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL
Mrs. Anyce Arrington 2330 Good Hope Road, S. E. Apt. 304, Washington, D.C. 20020	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"COMPUTATIONAL CENTERS FOR INDIVIDUAL AND SELF-HELP IMPROVEMENT"	7-9	T-1 (4)
Mrs. J. A. Ball 301-50th St. S.E. Apt. 3 Washington, D.C. 20019	ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH	"TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD"	7-9	T-2(4)
Mrs. Otelia E. Barnwell 9313 Pella Place Clinton, Maryland 20735	MINER ELEMENTARY	"ACTION AND INTERACTION"	1	X
Barbara P. Beam 2932 Vista St., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20018	MINER ELEMENTARY	"PUPIL SELF-HELP PROJECTS"	3	X
Mr. Ronald A. Berk 11900 Indigo Road Silver Spring, Md. 20906	THOMAS ELEMENTARY	"UNITED STATES-AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY"	5	X
Mrs. Ann Shaum Brown 1354 South 28th Street Arlington, Va. 22206	BUCHANAN ELEMENTARY	"ME, I AM AN IMPORTANT PERSON"	Non-Graded	X
Miss B.A. Campbell 2474 Alabama Avenue, S.E. Apt. 103, Washington, D.C. 20020	PAYNE ELEMENTARY	"THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB"	K-6	T-3 (4)
Mrs. B.H. Christopher 1840 Shepherd St., N.E. Washington, D. C. 20019	ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH	"TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD"	7-9	T-2 (4)
Miss Teresa Covacevich 2032 Belmont Road Washington, D.C. 20009	EASTERN HIGH	"A LITERARY-ARTS MAGAZINE FOR EASTERN"	High School	T-4 (2)
Mr. James V. Crivella 1270 Perry St., N.E. Apt. 34, Washington, D.C. 20017	SPINGARN HIGH	"CREATIVE DRAMATICS"	10-12	X
Mrs. Viola R. Egypt 3960 Suitland Rd., Apt. 203 Suitland, Md. 20023	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"COMPUTATIONAL CENTERS FOR INDIVIDUAL	7-9	T-1 (4)
Mrs. M.S. Ersminger 1511-22nd St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037	ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH	"TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD"	7-9	T-2 (4)

514



TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969-70

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE LEVEL	PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL
Gloria N. Ford 1358 Tucker St. N.W. Washington, D. C. 20011	MINER ELEMENTARY	"A PREVENTIVE APPROACH TO READING PROBLEMS"	Elem.	X
Mrs. Edna F. Frye 4213 Kinmount Road Lanham, Md. 20801	MAURY ELEMENTARY	PROJECT "WHAT" "WE HELP AND TEACH" PARENTS HELP AND LEARN WHAT IS GOING ON AND WHAT TO DO.	1	X
Mr. Julius E. Glover, Jr. 1649 Crittenden St. N.E. Washington, D.C. 20017	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"BASIC PHOTOGRAPHY"	7-9	T-5 (2)
Mr. Thomas Gornillon 1454 Irving St., N.W. Apt. 304 Washington, D.C. 20010	DAVIS ELEMENTARY	"PERCEPTUAL MOTOR DEVELOPMENT - STUDENT INVOLVEMENT"	2	X
Mr. Pinkney C. Hatton 1412 F Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002	ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH	"PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS"	7	T-6 (2)
Phyllis D. Hines 7610 F St., N.E. Apt. 202 Washington, D. C. 20027	GIRRS ELEMENTARY	"PROJECT SEE HEAR SAY"	Kgn.	X
Mrs. Vera G. Hunter 5511 First Street, N. E. Washington, D. C. 20011	VAN NESS ELEMENTARY	"FACES IN THE NEWS THROUGH THE USE OF SLIDES"	1-6	X
Norma B. Jackson 4237 Benning Road, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20019	THOMAS ELEMENTARY	"MEETING ETHNIC GROUPS THROUGH THEIR FOLKLORE AND CUSTOMS"	5 & 6	X
Anna Paige Johnson 905 E. Meadows Court Oxon Hill, Md. 20021	PLUMMER ELEMENTARY	"LISTENING STATIONS"	Kgn.	X
Mr. Donald B. Juncal 8710 Rosedale Lane Annandale, Virginia 22003	PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH	"VISUAL AIDS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COURSE"	10-12	T-7 (3)
Mr. Roscoe C. Lewis 100 Nicholson St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20011	PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH	"VISUAL AIDS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COURSE"	10-12	T-7 (3)
Mrs. Mary Etta Love 4204 - 18th Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20011	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"COMPUTATIONAL CENTERS FOR INDIVIDUAL and SELF-HELP IMPROVEMENT"	7-9	T-1 (4)
Mr. Robert McFadden 3900 14th St. N. W. Washington, D. C. 20011	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING BOOK AND FILM CLUB"	Jr.High	T-9(3)



TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969-70

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE LEVEL	PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL
Mrs. Lottie W. Medley 3122 32nd St., S.E. Washington, D.C. 20020	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"PEAK - PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL"	6	T-8 (6)
Mrs. Betty Jean Mikesell 8107 Garland Avenue Takoma Park, Md. 20012	ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH	"PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS"	7	T-6 (2)
Mrs. Janice G. Morman 7259 Cross Street Forestville, Md. 20028	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"PEAK - PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL"	6	T-8 (6)
Mrs. M.W. Myers 1714-62nd Avenue Cheverly, Md. 20785	RANDALL JUNIOR HIGH	"READING SEMINAR"	Jr. High	X
Mrs. Levon S. Nowood 4727 Bromley Avenue Suitland, Md. 20023	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"COMPUTATIONAL CENTER FOR INDIVIDUAL AND SELF-HELP IMPROVEMENT"	7-9	T-1 (4)
Miss Monica O'Connell 1218 Perry St., N.E. Apt. 11 Washington, D. C. 20017	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING BOOK AND FILM CLUB"	Jr. High	T-9 (3)
Mr. Guy A. Pandolfino 113 Pitt Lane Forest Heights, Md. 20021	PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH	"ORTHOPEDIC SHOE REPAIR"	10-12	X
Donna M. Parker 8518 Allendale Road Hyattsville, Md. 20785	EASTERN HIGH	"MEDIA PACKET"	10	X
Mrs. S. H. Patrick 2619 Naylor Rd., S.E. Apt. 101 Washington, D. C. 20020	PAYNE ELEMENTARY	"THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB"	K-6	T-3 (4)
Miss Novella E. Phifer 112 Galveston St., S.W. Washington, D. C. 20032	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"PEAK - PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL"	6	T-8 (6)
Mr. R.G. Phillips 2110 N. Monroe Street Arlington, Virginia 22207	PAYNE ELEMENTARY	"THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB"	K-6	T-3 (4)
Dorothea A. Preis 622 N. Carolina Ave., S.E. Washington, D.C. 20003	PAYNE ELEMENTARY	"PHOTO-BOOKS"	2	X
Mrs. Velma S. Prince 5574 B. Street, S.E. Apt. 104 Washington, D. C. 20019	YOUNG ELEMENTARY	"INDIVIDUALIZING PHONETIC SKILLS TO SUPPLEMENT BASIC TEXTBOOK PROGRAM"	1	X



TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GRoup II, 1969-70

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE LEVEL	PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL
Mrs. Janie B. Prue 1311 Kearny St., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20017	MINER ELEMENTARY	"BRIDGING THE LEARNING GAP IN READING"	4	X
Mrs. Lela G. Robinson 4269-6th Street, S.E. Washington, D.C. 20032	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"PEAK - PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL"	6	T-8 (6)
Mrs. Ruth P. Siegel 3911 N. Upland Street Arlington, Va. 22207	SPINGARN HIGH	"ARTS & CRAFTS OF AFRICA & THEIR APPLICATION TODAY"	10-12	X
Miss Patricia N. Simon 3212 W Street, S. E. Washington, D.C. 20020	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"PEAK - PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL"	6	T-8 (6)
Mrs. G. Smith 2634 Bowen Rd., S.E. Apt. 304 Washington, D. C. 20020	PAYNE ELEMENTARY	"THE PAYNE SCHOOL MATH CLUB"	K-6	T-3 (4)
Mr. James Smith 5031 First St., N. W. Apt. 304 Washington, D.C. 20011	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"BASIC PHOTOGRAPHY"	7-9	T-5 (2)
Mr. James Smith 5031 - First St., N.W. Apt. 304 Washington, D. C. 20011	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"SOME BIO-CHEMICAL LABORATORY TECHNIQUES"	Jr. High	T-10 (2)
Mr. Truman B. Smith 1922 Lakewood Street Suitland, Md. 20023	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"SOME BIO-CHEMICAL LABORATORY TECHNIQUES"	Jr. High	T-10 (2)
Mrs. Margaret B. Southall 4407 Edison Place, N. E. Washington, D. C. 20019	ELIOT JUNIOR HIGH	"TOTAL INVOLVEMENT IN WOMANHOOD"	7-9	T-2 (4)
S. B. Speier 1062 - 30th Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20007	PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH	"A SCHOOL-WIDE CAMPAIGN FOR READING IMPROVEMENT"	10-12	T-11 (11)
S. B. Speier 1062 - 30th Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20007	PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH	"AN EXPERIMENT OFFERING MONETARY REWARDS FOR THE MASTERY OF 220 BASIC SIGHT WORDS"	10	X
Mr. Charles Arnett Talbert 2538 Naylor Rd., S.E. Apt. 301 Washington, D.C. 20020	GIBBS ELEMENTARY	"EDUCATION FOR RELEVANCE-BLACK AWARENESS"	6	X
Mrs. Martha Taylor 1940 Brightseat Rd., Apt. 301 Landover, Md. 20785	SOUSA JUNIOR HIGH	"PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIVING BOOK AND FILM CLUB"	Jr. High	T-9 (3)

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND: GROUP II, 1969-70

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE LEVEL	PROJECT TEAM or INDIVIDUAL
Mr. Richard E. Taylor 5715 Blaine Street, N.E. Washington, D. C. 20019	PHELPS VOCATIONAL HIGH	"VISUAL AIDS FOR THE LANDSCAPE COURSE"	10-12	T-7 (3)
Doris S. Thompson 5116-11th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. 20011	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION" "WORKERS IN OUR BUILDING"	6	X
Mrs. Patricia P. White 2601 Branch Avenue, S. E. Washington, D. C. 20020	VAN NESS ELEMENTARY	"READING THROUGH MUSIC"	Primary	X
Mr. Joseph Willihoft 4717 Homer Ave., Apt. D Suitland, Md. 20023	PAYNE ELEMENTARY	"FILM MAKING IN THE SIXTH GRADE"	6	X
Mr. Joseph T. Wingate 3331-22nd St., S.E. Washington, D. C. 20020	KIMBALL ELEMENTARY	"PEAK-PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AT KIMBALL"	6	T-8 (6)
Mr. Richard C. Young 1514-17th St., N.W. Apt. 2 Washington, D. C. 20036	EASTERN HIGH	"A LITERARY-ARTS MAGAZINE FOR EASTERN"	High School	T-4 (2)

**PART II**

Round III of The Teacher Innovation  
Fund Awards Program was funded by an anonymous  
donor.

Sponsored by

The Office of Staff Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES .....	iii
EVALUATION SUMMARY .....	iv - v
<b>Chapter</b>	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. PROCEDURE .....	1
Sample .....	1
Instruments .....	1
Collection of Data .....	1-2
Analysis of Data .....	2
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	3-18
IV. CONCLUSION .....	19
V. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	19
VI. APPENDICES	
A. Pre Evaluation Instrument .....	20
B. Evaluation Checklist .....	24
C. Post Evaluation Instrument .....	26
D. Creativity Impact Measure .....	30
E. Round III Participants; Schools; Project Titles; Grade Levels; and Team or Individual Effort .....	33

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
I. Reasons for Seeking an Award .....	3
II. Benefits Received from the Project .....	4
III. Problems Encountered in Implementing the Projects .....	5
IV. Problems - A Comparison of Pre and Post Responses .....	6
V. Reasons for the Problems of Materials .....	7
VI. Anticipated and Used Teaching Techniques and Procedures.	8
VII. Expected Project Outcomes for Pupils .....	9
VIII. Expected Project Outcomes for Teachers .....	10
IX. Methods Planned for and Methods Used to Measure Outcomes .....	11
X. The Extent to Which Specific Outcomes Were Accomplished.	12
XI. Projects' Impact on Certain Variables .....	15
XII. Response as to Continuation of Projects .....	16

Evaluation Summary  
(Part II)

Title: Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program

Project location: Public Schools in the McKinley High School Area  
and the M.M. Washington Vocational High School

Date: School Year 1970-71

Target Population: 697 Teachers, librarians, counselors and resident  
specialists

Number Served: Teachers 43; Students 1100 (approx.)

Staff: Coordinated by the Office of Staff Development

Funding Allotment: \$200 per teacher

Procedure:

Every full-time teacher, librarian, counselor, or specialist resident to one of the schools in the target population was eligible to submit a proposal for an innovative classroom project. The proposals had to focus on one or more of the priorities identified in the Academic Achievement Plan. A committee established by the Office of Staff Development selected the proposals that met the criteria for funding.

Evaluation Plan:

Background information was gathered through interviews, on-site visitations and seminars. The following instruments were designed by the Department of Research and Evaluation in cooperation with the Office of Staff Development:

1. A Pre Evaluation Questionnaire
2. An Evaluation Checklist
3. A Post Evaluation Questionnaire
4. A Creativity Impact Measure

All of the evaluation instruments were administered to Round III participants. The Creativity Impact Measure was also administered to the participants of Round I and Round II. Comparisons were made between the pre and post responses of the Round III participants. Comparisons were also made of the responses, on the Creativity Impact Measure, given by Round I, Round II, and Round III participants.

### Results:

Teachers sought awards in order to provide: (1) additional and/or enriching experiences for the child; (2) to explore new teaching techniques; (3) and to provide additional teaching materials and up-to-date teaching aids. These were the main benefits received from the projects.

The main methods of instruction used were: individualized instruction; audio-visual aids; small group instruction; and remedial help. As a result: learning was improved; motivation increased; communication was improved; and attitudes were positively modified.

The participants felt that their projects enhanced "to some extent" most of the positive aspects of teaching and learning. They felt that their projects merited repetition. Many projects were repeated. Other projects required additional funding in order to be repeated.

### Conclusions:

The result of this evaluation indicates a very positive teachers' reaction toward the program. The awards led teachers to try and experiment on innovative ideas on classroom instructions. In implementing their projects, the participants were given a small amount of funding to purchase instructional materials and other small equipment which otherwise would not be available in the regular school allotment for educational supplies and materials.

The benefits derived from the program are numerous. Teachers' creative abilities were recognized; a healthy sense of competition was fostered; diversified teaching techniques to suit particular class situations were encouraged. All these factors are essential in creating a wholesome classroom atmosphere which generally lead to a common end result--better instruction on the part of the teachers and better achievement on the part of the students.

## INTRODUCTION

This is Part II of the evaluation of the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program (TIF). Part II covers the program for the school year 1970-71. Included also is a follow-up, through a Creativity Impact Measure, on participants awarded during the school years 1968-69 and 1969-70.

## PROCEDURE

### Sample

Participants for Round III were drawn from McKinley Tech Senior High School and its area feeder schools. M.M. Washington Vocational School was also included in this program. Every full-time teacher, librarian, counselor, or specialist resident to one of these schools was eligible for funding whether temporary, probationary or permanent. These teachers were invited to submit proposals for projects accompanied by budgets of up to \$200 per teacher for materials and supplies with which to implement their projects. The proposals had to focus on one or more of the priorities identified in the Academic Achievement Plan, i.e., reading, mathematics, and oral and written communication.

From the target population 60 proposals were received from 101 teachers in 15 schools. An advisory committee of classroom teachers and the Office of Staff Development reviewed the project designs and selected those that met the criteria for funding. The panel identified and awarded 29 projects for 43 teachers. Some of these teachers worked as a team on an innovative project.

### Instruments

The following instruments were developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation in cooperation with the Office of Staff Development:

- (1) Pre Evaluation Questionnaire
- (2) Evaluation Checklist
- (3) Post Evaluation Checklist
- (4) Creativity Impact Measure

### Collection of Data

The Pre- and Post-Evaluation questionnaires were administered to all Round III participants. The Evaluation Checklist was administered to nineteen Round III participants as a follow-up to the Pre-questionnaire

to get specifics concerning the problems they indicated involving the ordering of materials. The Creativity Impact Measure was mailed to all Round I, Round II and Round III participants as a follow-up.

### Analysis of Data

Totals and percentages were presented where numerical values were called for. For questions calling for first, second, and third choices a numerical value of: three for first choices; two for second choices; and one for third choices, was given to compute rankings. Means were computed for items that were rated on a scale. Comparisons were made of pre and post responses and of responses by Round I, Round II and Round III participants on the Creativity Impact Measure. Results were presented in narrative and tabular form.

The following scale is used to interpret mean values:

Scale	Not At All	Poor	Fairly Well	Very Well
Mean Value	.0 to .4	.5 to 1.4	1.5 to 2.4	2.5 to 3.4

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-questionnaires were completed by thirty-six Round III participants. Post-questionnaires were completed by twenty-one participants. Some of the teachers who did not respond indicated that due to late funding they decided to wait until school year 1971-72 to implement their projects. Fifteen teachers completed the evaluation checklist.

The teaching experience of the thirty-six participants completing the pre-questionnaire ranged from one to thirty years with a group mean of 11.01 years.

The twenty-one participants responding to the post questionnaire indicated that their projects served from ten (The Environmental Chemistry Project) to 207 (The Listening Station Project) students giving a total of 1,130 students served.

The majority of the participants found out about the existence of the Teacher Innovation Awards Program (TIF) through the Central School Office or through their principals.

The three main reasons given for seeking an award were: (1) to provide an additional and/or enriching experience for the child; (2) a desire to explore new teaching techniques; and (3) to provide additional teaching materials and up-to-date teaching aides. The ranking of the reasons given on the pre-questionnaire is shown in Table I.

TABLE I

Reasons For Seeking An Award (N=36)

Reasons	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st - 3rd
	1st	2nd	3rd	
To provide additional and/or enriching experience for the child	22	7	2	86
A desire to explore new teaching techniques	6	9	12	75
To provide additional teaching materials and up-to-date aides	2	14	6	61
Self-developed competency in a particular area	1	3	2	17
To gain additional skill in a specific teaching area	0	0	6	17

The three main benefits received as a result of the projects are the same as the main reasons for seeking an award. Table II gives the breakdown of the responses received on the post questionnaire.

TABLE II

Benefits Received From The Project (N = 21)

Benefits	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st-3rd
	1st	2nd	3rd	
Provision for additional and/or enriching experiences for the child	11	6	2	90
Freedom to explore new teaching techniques	6	7	4	81
Additional up-to-date teaching aides and materials	1	4	5	48
Gained additional skill in a specific teaching area	1	3	0	19
Self-developed competency in a particular area	0	0	5	24

The majority of the teachers were aided by co-teachers in preparing their proposal and also in implementing their projects. In many cases a considerable amount of time was needed for implementation. This was likely due to late funding and the difficulty in acquiring needed supplies and materials. Of the thirty-three teachers who responded to this item, seventeen indicated that it required more than a month to start their project; nine participants took less than a week; and seven, between a week and a month.

Most principals and other school personnel were highly favorable in their reaction to the innovative projects. A reaction of indifference was cited by only two participants.

The main problems encountered by the participants in implementing their projects were: (1) the unavailability of materials; (2) the difficulty in ordering materials; (3) inadequate physical facility, and (4) the difficulty in integrating the project into the total school program.

Table III gives the results of the pre-questionnaire responses to the problems that were encountered by the participants of Round III.

TABLE III

Problems Encountered In Implementing The Projects (N=36)

Problems	Teachers Indicating Each Rank			Percent Ranking 1st - 3rd
	1st	2nd	3rd	
Unavailability of materials	7	6	--	36
Difficulty in ordering materials	4	6	3	36
Inadequate physical facility	4	2	5	31
Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program	4	4	--	22
Lack of cooperation by school staff	2	--	2	11
Little or no assistance from resource personnel	1	1	1	8
Building repair	1	1	1	8
Other:				
(1) Shortage of funds	1	--	--	3
(2) Reading difficulties	1			3
(3) Security	--	--	1	3
Student apathy	--	--	1	3

The participants ranked the problems again on the post-questionnaire. The responses showed very little change from those considered the main problems on the pre-questionnaire. Table IV gives a comparison of the pre and post responses.

TABLE IV

## Problems - A Comparison of Pre And Post Responses

Problems	Ranking	
	Pre	Post
Unavailability of materials	1	1.5
Difficulty in obtaining materials	-	1.5
Difficulty in ordering materials	2	-
Inadequate physical facility	3	1.5
Difficulty in integrating project into the total school program	4	4
Lack of cooperation by school staff	5	N/A
Little or no assistance from resource personnel	6.5	7
Building repair	6.5	-
Other	8	6
Student apathy	9	5
Lack of cooperation by parents	N/A	8

N/A Not ranked as a problem.

- Not included on that questionnaire

The Office of Staff Development set up a checking account for each Round II participant. They had the opportunity of purchasing their own materials without going through regular school system channels as was done by Round I and Round II participants. It was thought that the checking account procedure would eliminate the problems surrounding the ordering and receiving of materials.

Analysis of the pre-questionnaire responses revealed that ordering instructional materials was the main difficulty Round III participants encountered in implementing their projects. In an effort to get to the very reasons for the teachers' problems, a questionnaire was designed to elicit responses which would delineate the specific problem areas. The responses are shown below:

TABLE V

Reasons For The Problems On Ordering Educational Materials (N=15)

Problems and Reasons	Number of Responses
1. Difficulty in ordering materials:	
Too little time between funding and implementation	5
Great length of time between ordering and delivery	3
Ordering procedures were not clearly understood	2
Lack of funds to cover additional costs of supplies	2
Decided it was no problem after all	2
Time wasted waiting for merchants to verify checks	1
Error in ordering	1
2. Unavailability of materials:	
Materials were slow in arriving or didn't arrive	9
Desired materials were not in stock	5
Lack of sufficient funds	3
Materials were ordered too late	3
Too little time between funding and implementation	2
Many items requested were not on the approved list	1
Could not locate sources of materials	1

More detailed explanations were given concerning the problems of ordering and receiving materials on the post questionnaire. These explanations by twenty-one respondents are given below. The frequency of responses are given in parenthesis.

1. The materials ordered finally came, but were slow in arriving (3).
2. The materials needed for implementing the project were not available upon initial order (3).
3. In some instances where orders were placed with a firm, they were referred to a local company causing a delay in delivery.
4. The order was incorrectly filled and had to be returned to the company as far away as California.
5. The materials are specially published and because of publishing difficulties and revisions the project could not be completed, but will be next year.
6. The difficulty was finding a set of encyclopedia; or reference books suited to the students' reading level that was priced within a \$50.00 range.

7. The money allotted did not cover the cost of all necessary materials.
8. The problem was finding a company or firm that carried the needed materials for the least amount of money.
9. No problem or difficulty. (9)

The main teaching techniques and procedures planned to be used to obtain the project objectives and the main teaching techniques and procedures actually used were: (1) individualized instruction; (2) audio-visual aids; (3) small group instruction; (4) remedial help, and learning stations. Table VI gives the comparative responses on the pre- and post questionnaires.

TABLE VI

Anticipated And Actual Teaching Techniques and Procedures

Techniques and Procedures	Number of Responses		Percent of Responses	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Individualized instruction	31	19	23	24
Audio-visual aids	29	15	21	19
Small group instruction	28	21	20	26
Remedial help	21	11	16	14
Establish learning stations	14	9	10	11
Trips, speakers, projects	6	1	4	1
Teacher aides	-	3	-	4
Student aides	1	1	1	1
Parent aides	1	-	1	-
Camera, Tape recorder	1	-	1	-
Programmed learning	1	-	1	-
Introspection	1	-	1	-
Fast learners	1	-	1	-
Total	135	80	100	100

The major expected outcomes for pupils as a result of the projects were: (1) improved learning; (2) increased motivation; (3) improved communication; (4) changed attitudes, and (5) individualized instruction. These and other expected outcomes are shown in the following table.

TABLE VII

## Expected Project Outcomes For Pupils

Expected Outcomes	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Improved learning	33	20
Increased motivation	31	19
Improved communication	27	16
Changed attitudes	26	16
Individualized instruction	26	16
Improved discipline	13	8
Improved self-concept	5	3
To relate learning to life	3	2
To restructure thinking for learning	1	-
To improve learning skills	1	-
Total	166	100

Thirty-three percent of the participants indicated that learning was "much improved" and sixty-two percent indicated that learning was "improved". The remaining five percent did not respond to this item.

The major expected outcomes for the teachers as a result of their projects were: (1) to develop new teaching techniques; (2) to acquire greater teaching skills; (3) to organize information, and (4) to write curriculum materials. In the following table are the participants' responses to these and other expected teacher outcomes.

TABLE VIII

## Expected Project Outcomes For Teachers

Expected Outcomes	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
To develop new teaching techniques	33	33
To acquire greater teaching skills	25	25
To organize information	20	20
To write curriculum materials	15	15
To develop team teaching techniques	5	5
To spearhead a project for primary grades	1	1
To bridge the communication gap between home and school	1	1
Total	100	100

To measure project outcomes the participants used a variety of methods. The methods the participants planned to use were the ones used most often. The primary methods were: (1) teacher observation; (2) pre-post testing; (3) teacher made tests; (4) behavioral checklists; (5) attitude checklists, and (6) standardized tests. See Table IX.

TABLE IX

## Methods Planned For and Methods Used to Measure Outcomes

Methods	Number of Responses		Percent of Responses	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Teacher observation	26	19	24	27
Pre-post testing	22	15	20	21
Teacher made tests	20	14	18	20
Use of behavioral checklist	17	4	15	6
Use of attitude checklist	10	5	9	8
Standardized tests	9	6	8	9
Finished product	2	3	2	4
Outside observation		3	-	4
Counselor-teacher-tutor conferences	2	-	2	-
Discussions, conversation with students	2	-	2	-
Peer evaluation	1	1	-	1
Recorded lessons and tapes	1	-	-	-
Total	112	70	100	100:

Of the twenty-one participants responding on the post-questionnaire, seventeen indicated that, in their opinion, the knowledge of innovative practices of teachers had "some" to a "great deal" of impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers. Only one indicated that this knowledge had no impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers.

All of the participants felt that their projects deserved extension because of the benefits to both pupils and teachers. To further illustrate the value of the projects the participants rated a list of specific outcomes of the projects for teachers and students. The obtained aggregate mean of 2.1 indicates that all of the specific outcomes were met "fairly well". The specific outcomes that were met "very well" are: (1) the projects helped to identify children's needs; (2) clues for understanding children's needs were acquired; (3) possible solutions to meet children's needs were found, and (4) varied ways of motivating children were developed. The only two specific outcomes that were rated as being "poorly" met were: (1) working relationships with parents and other community agencies were improved, and (2) school personnel was made aware of varied school and community resources. A few of the individual projects, however, were rated "fairly well" and "very well" in regard to accomplishing the two stated objectives. The rating of the specific outcomes are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

The Extent To Which Specific Outcomes Were Accomplished

Expectations and Outcomes	Item Mean	Not at all	Poor	Fairly Well	Very Well	Number Responding
1. Helped me identify children's needs.	2.6			8	10	18
2. Gave clues for understanding children's needs.	2.6		1	5	10	16
3. Provided possible solutions to meet children's needs.	2.5			9	8	17
4. Developed varied ways of motivating children.	2.5			11	10	21
5. Provided innovative teaching techniques in content areas.	2.4	1		9	10	20
6. Gave training in the use of devices used to measure growth of children	1.6	4	3	5	4	16
7. Provided training that led to a change in attitudes.	2.3		2	9	8	19
8. Made all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation	2.4		1	8	7	16
9. Promoted better working relationships with the school staff.	1.6	5	1	9	3	18
10. Improved working relationships with parents and other community agencies.	1.2	6	3	5	2	16
11. Made school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.	1.3	6	3	6	3	18
12. Promoted a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.	1.9	2	2	11	5	20
13. Helped teachers use classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.	1.9	4		7	7	18
14. Served as a motivator for the regular school year program.	2.2	2		8	7	17
Aggregate Mean	2.1					

Some of the participants made comments and suggestions about their projects and about the TIF Program. The comments and suggestions are listed below as quoted by the teachers. In instances where a comment or suggestion was made by more than one teacher it is noted by the number in parenthesis.

1. Increase the amount of funding so that several classes may be included and benefited.
2. I would like to see this program continue. I feel that it is of great assistance to teachers and encourages them to seek out new and innovative methods of teaching (3).
3. The materials we were able to acquire made our nursery play school a real learning laboratory for the pre-schoolers as well as the high school students in the "Creative Parents" project.
4. My project was not centered in any one classroom. The participants came from twelve different classrooms.
5. We were very pleased with the children's enthusiastic response to the "Independent Personal Reading Library". Every child showed a marked interest in the materials. They took books home every night to read to their parents. The upper grade children who served as listeners enjoyed the materials also. The children spend every free moment in the reading center.
6. I intend to begin the project again in September with a new class of children. I feel that beginning at the start of the school year will make the project do even more for the children. May I say how much I appreciated this opportunity.
7. The Teacher Innovation Awards Program idea is excellent! It is a great inspiration to a teacher to have ideas recognized. It is a thrilling experience to be able to use new ideas and to have the beautiful and new materials with which to inspire students.
8. Thank you for helping me introduce a new unit. I've been interested in it for a long time!
9. I enjoyed working with my project. I hoped that I could use the listening post in the media center, but, our school library is very small. I decided to circulate this as we do books. It worked well. If funds become available, we would like to add to our collection of tapes and recordings that would go with our listening post.

The Creativity Impact Measure offered the participants of Round I and Round II, along with Round III, opportunity to expound on the impact of their innovative projects on many aspects of teaching and learning; to give the present status of their projects; and to make additional comments and/or suggestions relative to their projects and/or the TIF Program.

The participants rated the extent to which their projects enhanced a list of variables. The list of variables that were rated are shown in Table XI with the comparative responses of the participants from each round of the TIF Program. Item number seven on the list is a negative item and, thus, the aggregate mean was computed separately from all other items.

With an obtained aggregate means of 2.3 and 2.4 the participants of Rounds I and II, respectively, felt that all variables (excluding item seven) were enhanced to "some" degree by the innovative projects, while the participants of Round III, with an aggregate mean response of 2.5, felt that their projects enhanced all of the variables "a great deal". Obtained aggregate means of 1.2, .7 and .9 for the variables in item seven indicate that the three groups of participants felt that their projects generated a "little" negative interactions on these variables. These results tend to support the expected outcomes. (Tables VII and VIII)

All participants felt that the following variables were enhanced "a great deal".

1. Their receptivity to new ideas
2. The motivation of students
3. The implementation of new ideas within the classroom
4. Their ability to translate ideas into action
5. Their ability to try other innovations
6. Their desire to translate ideas into action
7. Their desire to plan specifically
8. Their desire to try other innovations

Fifty participants responded to the question on continuation of projects beyond the year of funding. Thirty-six stated that their projects were being continued, while fourteen stated that their projects were going to terminate. See Table XII for the breakdown of responses by each round of participants.

TABLE XI  
Projects' Impact On Certain Variables

Items	Number of Responses														
	Round I N=14					Round II N=20					Round III N=25				
	A Great Deal	Some	Little	Not At All	Mean	A Great Deal	Some	Little	Not At All	Mean	A Great Deal	Some	Little	Not At All	Mean
My Project enhanced:															
1. my receptivity to new ideas	10	4	--	--	2.7	12	6	--	1	2.5	23	2	--	--	2.9
2. ideas for curriculum development	9	4	--	--	2.7	7	11	2	--	2.3	16	6	1	--	2.7
3. the motivation of students	11	3	--	--	2.8	12	8	--	--	2.6	20	3	--	--	2.9
4. implementation of new ideas within the classroom	10	2	--	--	2.8	11	8	--	--	2.6	17	6	--	--	2.7
5. implementation of new ideas within the building	3	5	3	3	1.6	5	9	3	3	1.8	5	13	3	1	2.0
6. positive interaction:															
a. with peers	6	7	1	--	2.4	8	11	1	--	2.4	11	11	1	--	2.4
b. with administration	6	5	2	1	2.1	3	10	4	--	1.9	9	10	--	3	2.1
c. with parents	6	3	2	3	1.9	3	6	6	--	1.8	4	8	3	2	1.3
d. with community	2	5	4	3	1.4	3	4	6	2	1.5	--	10	3	2	1.5
7. other than positive interaction:															
a. with peers	--	2	2	--	1.5	1	4	2	6	1.0	2	2	3	5	1.1
b. with administration	--	2	1	1	1.3	1	2	1	7	0.7	--	3	3	5	0.8
c. with parents	--	1	2	1	1.0	--	2	2	7	0.5	--	3	3	4	0.9
d. with community	--	1	2	1	1.0	--	1	3	7	0.5	--	1	4	4	0.7
8. my ability to:															
a. translate ideas into action	8	5	--	--	2.6	12	6	2	--	2.5	18	5	1	--	2.7
b. plan specifically	7	6	1	--	2.4	12	6	1	--	2.6	17	6	1	--	2.7
c. use the tools of evaluation	6	6	2	--	2.3	9	8	2	--	2.4	10	12	2	--	2.3
d. work with others	5	5	4	--	2.1	6	11	2	--	2.2	12	11	1	--	2.5
e. write proposals	6	3	4	--	2.2	9	6	2	--	2.4	9	13	1	--	2.3
f. try other innovations	6	3	--	--	2.7	11	7	1	--	2.5	16	6	--	--	2.7
9. my desire to:															
a. translate ideas into action	8	5	--	--	2.6	12	5	--	--	2.7	23	2	--	--	2.9
b. plan specifically	7	6	--	--	2.5	8	5	--	--	2.6	17	7	--	--	2.7
c. use the tools of evaluation	6	5	2	--	2.3	9	5	--	--	2.6	14	10	1	--	2.5
d. work with others	7	4	2	--	2.4	10	2	1	--	2.7	14	9	1	--	2.5
e. write proposals	6	3	3	--	2.3	9	4	1	--	2.6	13	7	4	--	2.4
f. try other innovations	7	4	1	--	2.5	12	5	--	--	2.7	18	4	--	1	2.7
Aggregate Mean For Item 7					1.2					0.7					0.9
Aggregate Mean (excluding Item 7)					2.3					2.4					2.5

TABLE XII

Responses As To Continuation of Projects

Participants	Number of Projects		Total
	Continued	Terminated	
Round I	7	5	12
Round II	10	6	16
Round III	19	3	22
Totals	36	14	50

The explanations given as to how their projects could be continued without funding are given below. The number in parenthesis following the explanation indicates the number of participants citing that explanation.

1. The same materials can be used without additional funds. (20)
2. With some changes we are able to continue the basic idea. (5)
3. We received additional materials from other sources. (5)
4. The children are helping with fund raising. (2)
5. Received funds from the school library fund.
6. I am using some personal funds.
7. By reproducing materials from originals.

The following are the explanations given by the fourteen participants why their projects are not being continued beyond funding year.

1. Additional funds are necessary for continuation. (8)
2. Because of staff and curriculum reorganization. (4)
3. I was promoted to an administrative position.
4. I am involved in other activities.

Seven, eight and seventeen participants of Rounds I, II and III, respectively, stated that as a result of a year's experience (more than a year for Rounds I and II) modifications had been made in their projects. The modifications cited by the participants were as follows:

1. The methods and ideas used in my project have been adopted in other classes. (3)
2. The project was designed for a small group, but has been re-designed to serve a large group. (3)
3. The project was expanded to include a greater variety of skills. (3)

4. The project was implemented by other teachers. (3)
5. We found that working with smaller groups is more profitable. (2)
6. A better process was developed for reaching pupils with reading needs.
7. We have instituted a project course of study for other teachers.
8. The alphabet is now being taught along with the phonics chart.
9. New methods of evaluating are being tried.
10. Demonstrations are held for the teachers.
11. The project as redesigned to fit the A.A.P. guidelines.
12. Sound has been added to our films and slides. (2)
13. Classroom management, teaching techniques, and curriculum have been changed to meet learning disabilities. (2)

Other outgrowths of the innovative projects were evident as stated by eight Round I, fifteen Round II, and eighteen Round III participants. They are as follows:

1. There is increased concern among other teachers concerning learning disabilities and behavior modification. (14)
2. There is increased motivation and desire to achieve among pupils. (9)
3. I have been invited to join a writing team in environmental science and one of our projects won first place at the science fair.
4. We had an exhibit at Georgetown, and some students sold their work.
5. An orthopedic and artificial limb shop is being installed at D.C. General.
6. We are presently experimenting with contract method and open classroom.
7. Some tutors have begun to work with pupils on weekends.
8. There is a possibility of a day care center being established.
9. Many of the activities are utilized as part of the A.A.P.
10. An anthology of pupils' writings is being compiled.
11. Students can progress on their own with the electronic kits.
12. A science club has been started at school.
13. Plans have been made to form an art club.
14. The administrator became aware of the pupils' progress.
15. There is greater cooperation and interaction among students.
16. Pupils are "test conscious" and better able to concentrate in all areas.
17. There is a desire for summer classes.

Comments and suggestions were given by teacher in each of the three groups. These comments and suggestions are listed separately by groups.

#### Round I (N=5)

1. Until filmstrip is perfected, the slides in the "Library-Jet-Age Learning Approach Project" are being used to great advantage with students, with visitors from foreign lands and with others from neighboring schools. The latter are those who want to see a media center in a classroom remodeled to house a library.

2. I enjoyed doing the project and I would like to see it continued.
3. It would be advantageous to children if primary grades were de-  
partmentalized the way project "T.M.A." was.
4. This has been a fantastically rewarding experience. My greatest  
joy has been in having reached the non-readers in my class and  
seeing them "crack the code" of reading and achievement.
5. I thank TIF many times over. The freedom to experiment has made  
me a more informed, flexible teacher, better able to understand  
and work with the children in my classroom.

Round II (N=6)

1. Such a project could be beneficial throughout the summer with  
very young children for reading readiness.
2. I do, definitely, plan to continue my project in ego development  
next year. I also plan to enlist more parent help for my experience  
stories.
3. I have been able to pass on some ideas to teachers in other schools.
4. I had hoped to motivate my students to read and to do some research  
in African cultural history. I accomplished some of this. The  
students are proud of their knowledge.
5. Efforts should be made to see that successful innovative projects  
are continued and expanded. (2)

Round III (N=15)

1. I think the innovative fund gives incentive to teachers and provides  
additional opportunities for students.
2. Being a TIF winner has been a meaningful experience for me. (2)
3. Thanks for your aid. Keep advertising it. (2)
4. It has been a deep satisfaction to be able to offer more to my  
students and to help them individually.
5. I am grateful for the award and will continue my project with  
limited personal funds.
6. The self image of most of the children has improved and in addition  
a large percent have developed an enjoyment of reading.
7. The award increased the prestige of our department in the eyes of  
the students, faculty and administrator.
8. We had to overcome the initial problems of scheduling and of  
student apathy. Overall the project was a success.
9. It would be nice to be refunded. I found these projects to be  
one of the best learning devices I have encountered.
10. A new way is needed to report students' progress to parents. (2)
11. More programs of this nature should be established by the Office  
of Staff Development. This program has created new ideas among  
faculty and students.
12. Complete evaluation is difficult. I am getting individual  
positive reactions, but I would like to have more time.

## CONCLUSIONS

The responses indicate that the teachers were appreciative and very happy to have had the opportunity to try their own ideas in a teaching situation. They feel that their projects served a worthwhile cause, that of motivating children to learn, while improving learning. They feel that they were able to improve their own teaching skills while also acquiring additional teaching materials. The benefits received were not limited to the TIF winners and the students they served. Ideas, techniques, materials, and procedures relative to motivating and meeting the learning difficulties of students were disseminated among many non-involved teachers creating interest and desire on the part of many others to try innovative projects without being funded.

The Innovative Methods Processing Center (IMP), discussed briefly in Part I of this report, under the direction and leadership of Mr. Charles Talbert, a Round II participant, involved directly a group of IMP Teachers. These are teachers, not TIF winners, who agreed to try an innovative project during the 1970-71 school year. As a result of a proposal written by Mr. Talbert, funding was received for a three week course at D.C. Teachers College to train the IMP Teachers in preparing teacher learning packages to be used by other teachers to carry out innovative projects. The IMP Teachers received four graduate credits; \$125 each for materials; and a \$150 stipend. Each teacher prepared three instructional packages relating to their own project for dissemination. A display of this work was presented at the Summer Leadership Training Institute held at Rabaut Junior High School, June 28 thru July 22, 1971.

Many booklets and other instructional materials have been compiled and disseminated as a result of the TIF program. These materials were developed by the Office of Staff Development, the IMP Center, and by individual TIF winners and their students.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue the Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program.
2. Arrange the schedule for submitting proposals and awarding grants to allow each winner time to order and receive materials needed for the implementation of the project at the beginning of the school year.
3. Furnish each newly awarded participant with a compiled list of companies and firms known to stock materials and supplies needed to implement successful innovative projects.
4. Future TIF Winners should explore the possibility of involving more community resources in their innovative projects.

**APPENDIX A**  
**PRE-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT**

Teacher Innovation Fund Awards Program  
Pre-Evaluation Instrument  
Prepared by the Department of Research and Evaluation, April 1970  
Revised January 1971

The Office of Staff Development is interested in obtaining information from you about the project you have designed for experimentation in your classroom. Please respond to the following. Thank you.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Grade/Subject \_\_\_\_\_ No. of yrs. you have taught \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. How did you find out about the existence of the Teacher Innovation Grants?

\_\_\_\_\_ Central school office \_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor  
\_\_\_\_\_ Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify)

2. For what reasons did you seek an award? (Please rank from the most important reasons to the least important 1, 2, 3, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Specialized training in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Self-developed competency in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ a desire to explore new teaching techniques  
\_\_\_\_\_ to gain additional skill in a specific teaching area  
\_\_\_\_\_ to provide an additional and/or enriching experience for the child  
\_\_\_\_\_ to provide additional teaching materials  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other

3. Who aided you in preparing your proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_ University personnel \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Specialist \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor  
\_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Co-Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ No one \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please Specify)

4. How much time will/did it take you to get the objectives and contents of your project implemented with the students?

\_\_\_\_\_ less than one week \_\_\_\_\_ less than one month  
\_\_\_\_\_ one to two weeks \_\_\_\_\_ more than one month

5. What problems did you encounter in the initial implementation of the project? (Please rank from the greatest problem to the least 1, 2, 3, etc.)

- lack of cooperation by school staff
- student apathy
- unavailability of materials
- inadequate physical facility
- difficulty in integrating project in the total school program
- lack of cooperation by parents
- little or no assistance from resource personnel
- difficulty in ordering materials
- building repair
- other

6. What techniques and procedures will you use to obtain your objectives?

- individualize instruction       audio-visual aids
- small group instruction       establishment of learning stations
- remedial help       other (please specify)

7. What are your expected outcomes?

a. Pupil

- improve learning
- change attitudes
- individualize instruction
- increase motivation
- improve communication
- improve discipline
- other (specify)

b. Teacher

- organize information
- acquire skills
- develop new techniques
- write curriculum materials
- other (specify)

8. How do you plan to determine the degree to which these outcomes are met in your evaluation of your project?

\_\_\_\_\_ pre-post testing

\_\_\_\_\_ standardized tests

\_\_\_\_\_ teacher made tests

\_\_\_\_\_ use of behavioral objectives check-  
list

\_\_\_\_\_ attitudinal checklist

\_\_\_\_\_ observation record

\_\_\_\_\_ other (specify)

Comments:

APPENDIX B  
EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Teacher Innovation Fund  
Evaluation Checklist

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Check the items you consider to be contributors to the main problems concerning materials. Use the back for detail explanations.

1. Difficulty in ordering materials was due to:

- \_\_\_\_\_ desired materials were not in stock
- \_\_\_\_\_ could not locate sources of materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ materials were non-existent
- \_\_\_\_\_ too little time between funding and implementation
- \_\_\_\_\_ ordering procedures were not clearly understood
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify)

2. Unavailability of materials was due to:

- \_\_\_\_\_ desired materials were not in stock
- \_\_\_\_\_ could not locate sources of materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ materials were non-existent
- \_\_\_\_\_ too little time between funding and implementation
- \_\_\_\_\_ lack of sufficient funds
- \_\_\_\_\_ materials ordered too late
- \_\_\_\_\_ materials were slow in arriving
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify)

3. Please elaborate (explain in detail on the back) the main items checked above.

APPENDIX C  
POST-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND  
Post Evaluation Instrument

The Office of Staff Development is interested in finding out how you feel about the project you designed for experimentation in your classroom. Please respond. Thank you.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Project \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Students Served \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

PART I

1. What benefits have you received as a result of being awarded a grant. (Please rank from most to least 1, 2, 3, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Specialized training in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Self-developed competency in a particular area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Freedom to explore new teaching techniques  
\_\_\_\_\_ The gain of additional skill in a specific teaching area  
\_\_\_\_\_ Provision for additional and/or enriching experiences for the child  
\_\_\_\_\_ Additional up-to-date teaching aides  
\_\_\_\_\_ None  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other( Please specify)

2. Who aided you in implementing your project?

\_\_\_\_\_ University personnel \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Specialist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ Principal \_\_\_\_\_ Co-Teacher  
\_\_\_\_\_ No one \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Please specify)

3. What was the reaction of the principal and other school personnel regarding your project?

\_\_\_\_\_ highly favorable  
\_\_\_\_\_ favorable  
\_\_\_\_\_ indifferent  
\_\_\_\_\_ unfavorable  
\_\_\_\_\_ extremely critical

4. What problems did you encounter in the implementation of the program? ( Please rank from greatest to least, 1, 2, 3, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ lack of cooperation by school staff  
\_\_\_\_\_ student apathy  
\_\_\_\_\_ unavailability of materials  
\_\_\_\_\_ inadequate physical facility  
\_\_\_\_\_ difficulty in integrating project in the total school program  
\_\_\_\_\_ lack of cooperation by parents  
\_\_\_\_\_ little or no assistance from resource personnel  
\_\_\_\_\_ difficulty in obtaining materials  
\_\_\_\_\_ other

5. What techniques and procedures did you use to obtain your objectives?  
(Please rank 1, 2, 3, etc.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ individualized instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ small group instruction
- \_\_\_\_\_ remedial help
- \_\_\_\_\_ audio-visual aides
- \_\_\_\_\_ establishment of learning stations
- \_\_\_\_\_ parent aide
- \_\_\_\_\_ teacher aides
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (Please specify)

6. To what degree was learning improved as a result of implementation of your program?

- \_\_\_\_\_ much improved
- \_\_\_\_\_ improved
- \_\_\_\_\_ little improvement
- \_\_\_\_\_ no improvement

7. How did you measure your outcomes?

- \_\_\_\_\_ pre and post testing
- \_\_\_\_\_ standardized tests
- \_\_\_\_\_ teacher-made tests
- \_\_\_\_\_ teacher observation
- \_\_\_\_\_ outside observation
- \_\_\_\_\_ student's behavior checklist
- \_\_\_\_\_ student's attitude checklist
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (specify)

8. In your opinion does knowledge of innovative practices of teachers have any impact on the professional growth of non-involved teachers?

\_\_\_\_\_ not at all \_\_\_\_\_ little \_\_\_\_\_ some \_\_\_\_\_ a great deal

9. Does the project have enough value for students to merit repetition?

\_\_\_\_\_ not at all \_\_\_\_\_ little \_\_\_\_\_ some \_\_\_\_\_ a great deal

10. If you have encountered any problems in ordering materials and/or the unavailability of materials, please explain the situations here.



APPENDIX D  
CREATIVITY IMPACT MEASURE

OFFICE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT  
TEACHER INNOVATION FUND  
CREATIVITY IMPACT MEASURE

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 School \_\_\_\_\_ Project (Name) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date Proposal Was Funded \_\_\_\_\_ Date Funding Ended \_\_\_\_\_

Your candid response to this instrument will give us valuable information about the total TIF Program.

I. Place a check in the appropriate column to indicate the extent to which your project enhanced:

	Not Appli- cable	Not At All	Little	Some	A Great Deal
1. your receptivity to new ideas					
2. ideas for curriculum develop- ment					
3. the motivation of students					
4. implementation of new ideas with- in the classroom					
5. implementation of new ideas within the building					
6. positive interaction:					
a. with peers					
b. with administration					
c. with parents					
d. with community					
7. other than positive interaction:					
a. with peers					
b. with administration					
c. with parents					
d. with community					

OSD-TIF 150/

	Not Appli- cable	Not At All	Little	Some	A Great Deal
8. your ability to:					
a. translate ideas into action					
b. plan specifically					
c. use the tools of evaluation					
d. work with other					
e. write proposals					
f. try other innovative projects					
9. your desire to:					
a. translate ideas into action					
b. plan specifically					
c. use the tools of evaluation					
d. work with others					
e. write proposals					
f. try other innovative projects					

II.

1. Is your project being continued beyond funding?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ (If Yes tell how; If No, explain why not)

2. Are there modifications being made as a result of your project?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ (If Yes, explain; If No, explain why not)

3. Are there any other kinds of out growth from the project?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ (Explain)

III. Suggestions or comments

Prepared By:  
Department Research and Evaluation  
January, 1971

APPENDIX E

ROUND III PARTICIPANTS: SCHOOLS:  
PROJECT TITLES: GRADE LEVELS TAUGHT: AND  
TEAM AND/OR INDIVIDUAL EFFORT

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III - 1970-71 CYCLE

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
1. Martha Kavanaugh 5322 Wakefield Road Bethesda, Maryland 20016 PHONE: 657-4126	McKINLEY Senior High 2nd and T Sts., N.E. William H. Rumsey 629-6071	LIVING AMERICAN HISTORY	History	X
2. Virginia Dougherty 3511 N. Nottingham Arlington, Virginia PHONE: 536-7119	" " "	FUTURE CREATIVE PARENTS	Home Economics	X
3. Jean W. Randolph 135 47th Street, N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 398-4875	" " "	TRIP, Tech's Reading Improve- ment Program	ENGLISH	X
4. Gwendolyn Holland 1808 Tamarack St., N.W. Washington, D. C. 20012 PHONE: 829-0414	" " "	INDIVIDUALIZING ALGEBRA I	Mathematics	X
5. Howard S. White 2409 Lewisdale Drive W. Hyattsville, Md. 20783 PHONE: 422-7627	" " "	LEARNING THROUGH CONSTRUCTIONS	Science	2
6. John W. Sperry, III 908 Erie Avenue, #3 Takoma Park, Md. 20012 PHONE:	" " "	" " "	"	
7. Stan Boyd 12031 Valleywood Dr. Silver Spring, Md. PHONE: 942-6627	" " "	INCORPORATING THE TEACHING OF READING SKILLS IN THE STUDY OF GOVERNMENT	History	4

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
8. Ruth Byrd 1830 Varnum St., N.W. Washington, D. C. 20011 PHONE:	" " "	INCORPORATING THE TEACHING OF READING SKILLS IN THE STUDY OF GOVERNMENT	History	4
9. Mrs. John Farrell 1627 Montague St., N.W. Washington, D. C. PHONE: TU. 2-9522	McKINLEY Senior High 2nd and T Sts., N.E. William H. Rumsey PHONE: 629-6071	INCORPORATING THE TEACHING OF READING SKILLS, etc.	History	4
10. Jan Jakusz 1724 Q Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 462-6342	" " "	" " "	"	4
11. Shendrine B. Henry 2718 26th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 529-4529	" " "	ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTRY	Science	X
12. Helen W. Holmes 3917 22nd St., N.E. Washington, D.C. 20018 PHONE: 529-4205	M.M. WASHINGTON Vocational, 0 St., bet. 1st & No. Cap. Sts., N. W. James O. Snowden-629-6867	REACHING OUT WITH THE BEAUTIFUL TRUTH	English	X
13. Toby Levin (Mrs.) 3404 Curtis Dr., #201 Hillcrest Heights, Md. PHONE: 899-1960	" " "	INDIVIDUALIZING LEARNING THROUGH STATIONS	History	2
14. Sandra J. Fascell 3421 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. PHONE: 966-1412	" " "	" " "	"	

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
15. Peggy Joyce Pate 3400 24th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: LA. 9-1245	M.M. WASHINGTON Vocational, 0 St., bet. 1st & No. Cap. Sts., N.W. James O. Snowden - 629-6867	A TOTAL EXPERIENCE IN CLOTHING	Home Economics	X
16. Etta D. Arnold 4133 Lee St., N.E. Washington, D.C. PHONE: 396-0282	" " "	BRINGING THE FACTORY METHOD OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION INTO THE CLASSROOM	Home Economics	X
17. V. Susie Oliphant 4212 14th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 529-1927	HAMILTON Junior High 6th & Brentwood Pkwy., N.E., Clinton M. Mattingly-620-6801	ENVIRONMENT SCIENCE	Science	X
18. Bonita J. Peeler 411 3rd St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 543-7771	" " "	YOUR CREATION: FROM START TO FINISH	Home Economics	2
19. Richard F. Arey 2832 30th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 832-7571	" " "	" " "	Art	
20. John A. Skehan 3810 East Cap. St., N.E. Washington, D.C. PHONE: 396-7159	Taft Junior High 18th & Perry Sts., N.E. Lee Etta Powell 629-7821	VISUAL LITERACY	Reading	X
21. Carolyn S. Taylor 4403 H St., S.E. Washington, D.C. PHONE: 582-0630	LANGLEY Junior High 1st & T Sts., N.E. Margaret Murray 629-6121	ACTIVITY - CENTER MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM	Mathematics	2

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
22. Sondra A. Legall 6420 2nd Pl., N.W. Washington, D.C. PHONE: 829-5963	LANGLEY Junior High 1st & T Sts., N.E. Margaret Murray 629-6121	ACTIVITY-CENTER MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM	Mathematics	
23. Consuella O'Neal 1400 Varnum St., N.W. Washington, D. C. PHONE: RA 3-0325	LANGLEY Junior High 1st & T Sts., N.E. Washington, D. C. Margaret Murray 629-6121	URBAN GEOGRAPHY AUDIO-VISUAL LIBRARY	Social Studies	2
24. Roland Rier 5 Vee Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. phone: 387-4942	LANGLEY Junior High 1st & T Sts., N.E. Margaret Murray 629-6121	URBAN GEOGRAPHY AUDIO-VISUAL LIBRARY	Social Studies	
25. Purnell W. Lawrence 4613 Eastern Ave., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 779-2496	BUNKER HILL Elementary 14th & Michigan Ave., N.E. Emma M. Carter 629-7801	INDEPENDENT PERSONAL READING LIBRARY	Librarian	2
26. Claudia Thompson 4408 Kinmount Rd. Lanham, Maryland PHONE: 459-4195	BUNKER HILL Elementary 14th & Michigan Ave., N.E. Emma M. Carter 629-7801	INDEPENDENT PERSONAL READING LIBRARY	Grade 1	
27. Purnell W. Lawrence 4613 Eastern Ave., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 779-2496	BUNKER HILL Elementary 14th & Michigan Ave., N.E. Emma M. Carter 629-7801	3 M PROJECT	Librarian	2

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
28. Katherine Cyrus 832 Thurman Ave. Hyattsville, Md. PHONE: 422-2477	BUNKER HILL Elementary 14th & Michigan Ave., N.E. Emma M. Carter 629-7801	3 M PROJECT	Grade 5	
29. Gloria W. Greene 3803 17th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 526-3649	BURROUGHS Elementary 18th & Monroe Sts., N.E. Doris H. Hundley 629-7014	TURN ON - EXPRESS YOURSELF	Grade 6	X
30. Patricia A. Haring 3310 Ross Pl., N.W. Washington, D. C. PHONE: WO 6-8593	ECKINGTON Elementary Quincy Pl. & First St. N.E., Mary C. Thompson 629-6104	LAUREATE FLEXIBLE READING	Grade 1	X
31. Janice R. Bragg 5264 Marlboro Pike #301 Hillside, Maryland PHONE: 736-6721	ECKINGTON Elementary Quincy Pl. & First St., N.E., Mary C. Thompson 629-6104	STATION FOR LISTENING	Librarian	X
32. Melville T. Turner, Jr. 1325 North Carolina Ave. N.E., Wash., D. C. PHONE: 544-4762	EMERY Elementary Lincoln Rd. & S St., N.E. Frederick P. Baluch 629-6987	INNOVATIVE ELEMENTARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Physical Ed.	X
33. Doris Barlow 5311 Mohican Rd. Washington, D.C. PHONE: 229-6685	EMERY Elementary Lincoln Rd. & S St., N.E. Frederick P. Baluch 629-6987	GETTING TO KNOW ME	Counselor	X
34. Florene K. Jones 4122 13th Pl., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 526-0679	GAGE Elementary 2nd & U Sts., N.W. Mary C. Thompson 629-7781	USING PHOTO-SITUATIONS TO ENCOURAGE POSITIVE SELF- CONCEPTS IN DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN	Grade 5	X

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
35. Margaret O. Washington 1329 Allison St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 526-7392	LANGDON Elementary 20th & Franklin Sts., N.E. Ernest Mercer 629-7091	GETTING TO KNOW YOURSELF	Grade 6	2
36. Sonja H. Robinson 3000 7th St., N.E. #116 Washington, D.C. PHONE: 529-0593	" " " "	GETTING TO KNOW YOURSELF	Physical Ed.	2
37. Moncerie J. Woolfolk 3938 17th St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 832-4507	LEWIS Elementary 300 Bryant Street, N.W. Mrs. Evelyn Smith 629-7147	NEWSPAPERS "4" READING	Grade 6	X
38. Lucy K. Brown 231 Missouri Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20011 PHONE: 726-1035	MOTT Elementary 4th & W Sts., N.W. Armeta G. Molley 629-7027	NEW ADVENTURES IN THE TUTORING OF READING	Reading Specialist	3
39. Winona K. Blackburn 3523 Porter St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20016 PHONE: 362-5878	" " " "	NEW ADVENTURES IN THE TUTORING OF READING	Grade 4	3
40. Mary E. Stith 11235 Oak Leaf Dr., #2020 Silver Spring, Md. PHONE: 593-2891	MOTT Elementary 4th and W Sts., N.W. Armeta G. Molley 629-7027	NEW ADVENTURES IN THE TUTORING OF READING	MIND Program	3
41. Maryhall F. Robinson 7107 Walker Mill Rd. District Hgts., Md. PHONE: 350-1138	SHADD Elementary 56th & E. Cap. Sts., N.E. Marjorie Buchanan 629-6931	REINFORCING THE TEACHERS' INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	MIND Program	X

TEACHER INNOVATION FUND - ROUND III (continued)

TEACHER/HOME ADDRESS	SCHOOL/ADDRESS/PRINCIPAL	PROJECT TITLE	GRADE/SUBJECT	INDIVIDUAL/TEAM
42. Arabelle Finney 2012 Perry St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 529-8076	WOODRIDGE Elementary Carlton & Central Aves., N.E. Barbara K. Stathis 629-7087	WORD POWER	English	2
43. Andrea Harper 233 Channing St., N.E. Washington, D. C. PHONE: 832-2437	" " " "	WORD POWER	Second Grade	2